DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 035 CS 500 249

AUTHOR	Rosenblatt, Bernard S., Ed.; Ingham, Susan D., Ed.
TITLE	Report of the Aesthetic Education Center (American Educational Theatre Association Convention, Chicago, Illinois, August, 1971).
INSTITUTION	American Educational Theatre Association, Washington, D.C.; Central Midwestern Regional Educational Lab., St. Ann, Mo.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	103p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Theatre Assn., 1317 F. Street N. W., Washington, D. C. 20004 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Aesthetic Education; Art Education; *Cultural Enrichment; Drama; *Educational Objectives; Fine Arts; *Teacher Education; *Theater Arts

ABSTRACT

This report is a transcription of the proceedings of the Aesthetic Education Center meeting of 1971, sponsored by AETA and CEMREL, Inc. Following an opening statement, the report summarizes a panel discussion on "What Is Aesthetic Education?" which centered on finding approaches to relating the arts programs in schools more closely and in new ways to students and the public at-large. The second presentation dealt with three current aesthetic education projects: the Rhode Island Arts in Education project, the JDR 3rd Fund's Arts in Education program, and the Aesthetic Education program of CEMREL, Inc. This was followed by a discussion session devoted to an attempt to perceive a process of evaluation and its relationship to aesthetic education in general and to theater in particular. The fourth session was based on the implications of aesthetic education for the education of teachers, and the meeting concluded with a summary statement on aesthetic education and its importance, particularly to the "underprivileged, the undereducated, and the underperceptive" child. (RN)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 077035

AMERICAN
THEATRE
ASSOCIATION

1971 CONVENTION

REPORT
OF THE
AESTHETIC
EDUCATION
CENTER

Report of the Aesthetic Education Center

AETA Convention 1971

sponsored jointly by the American Educational Theatre Association and the Aesthetic Education Program of CEMREL, Inc., August 16, 17, and 18 in Chicago, Illinois

Published by the American Theatre Association in cooperation with CEMREL, Inc., a private nonprofit corporation supported in part as a regional educational laboratory by funds from the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

Copyright © 1972 CEMREL, Inc.

American Theatre Association, 1317 F. Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004

Aesthetic Education Program, CEMREL, Inc., 10646 St. Charles Rock Road, St. Louis, Missouri 63074.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CEMREL, Inc.

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Price-$3.00 ($2.00 to ATA members)

Organizing Chairman of the Aesthetic Education Center and
General Editor of this report Bernard S. Rosenblatt, CEMREL, Inc.

Coordinator Anthony Reid, ATA

Editor Susan D. Ingham, CEMREL, Inc.

With the recognition that aesthetic education was gaining interest with many educators, the 1971 Program Committee perceived the need to explore this area of study at the Chicago Convention, August 15-18. As CEMREL, Inc., a national educational laboratory, was developing a curricular system in aesthetic education it seemed appropriate for the two organizations, ie. AETA and CEMREL to jointly sponsor the Aesthetic Education Center. From the beginning it was believed that a publication would be desirable to provide a detailed report, not only for the many Center participants, but for the field at large in order to stimulate continuing dialogue and work in this important area of study.

ATA gratefully acknowledges the extensive support of CEMREL, Inc. in the organizing of the CENTER and in the preparation of this report: Stanley S. Madeja, Director of the Aesthetic Education Program; Susan Ingham, Editor of this Report; Sharon Bocklage, Editorial Coordinator of the Aesthetic Education Program; and Mary Runge and Jennie Turnbough for typing the manuscript.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

David Addington, Associate Professor of Speech and Dramatic Arts, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio

Thomas Beagle, Drama Director, Antioch High School, Antioch, California

Sharon Bocklage, Editorial Coordinator, Aesthetic Education Program, CEMREL, Inc., St. Louis, Missouri

Arthur Custer, Director, Arts in Education Project, Rhode Island State Council on the Arts

Donald Jack Davis, Professor, Department of Art, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas

George Gunkle, Chairman, Department of Drama, San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge, California

Burnet Hobgood, Chairman, Division of Dramatic Arts, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas

Harlan Hoffa, Head, Department of Art Education, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania

Stanley Madeja, Director, Aesthetic Education Program, CEMREL, Inc., St. Louis, Missouri

Jack Morrison, Associate Director, Arts in Education Program, JDR 3rd Fund, Inc., New York, New York

Calvin Lee Pritner, Chairman, Department of Theatre, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois

Bernard S. Rosenblatt, Chairman, Aesthetic Education Center, 1971 AETA Convention and Coordinator of Teacher Education, CEMREL, Inc., St. Louis, Missouri

Robert C. Smith, Professor, School of Music, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois

Morris Weitz, "Responder-in-Residence," Aesthetic Education Center, 1971 AETA Convention, and Professor of Philosophy, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts

Asahel Woodruff, Specialist, Curriculum Development and Psychology, Bureau of Educational Research, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah

CONTENTS

Monday August 16

KEYNOTE GENERAL SESSION

Aesthetic Education, Key Issue for the Arts in the 1970s
Bernard S. Rosenblatt.....1

Tuesday August 17

WHAT IS AESTHETIC EDUCATION?: A Panel Discussion
Moderator--*Morris Weitz*
Panel--What Aesthetic Education Isn't
Harlan Hoffa.....5

On the Question: What Is Aesthetic Education?
Robert C. Smith.....11

Aesthetic Learning Environment
Burnet Hobgood.....15

Panel-Audience Dialogue.....21

PRESENTATION AND WORKSHOP CENTERED ON SPECIFIC PROGRAMS NOW DEVELOPING IN AESTHETIC EDUCATION

Arts in Education Project, Rhode Island Council on the Arts
Arthur Custer, Raymond Picozzi, Beth Pollock, and Naida Weisberg.....31

Arts in General Education, JDR 3rd Fund Project, University City, Missouri
Jack Morrison and Judie Contrucci.....37

The Aesthetic Education Program, CEMREL, Inc., St. Louis, Missouri
Stanley S. Madeja and Sharon Bocklage.....45

EVALUATION FOR AESTHETIC EDUCATION: A Discussion
Moderator--*George Gunkle*
Panel--*Asahel D. Woodruff*
Donald Jack Davis
David Addington.....55

Wednesday August 18

IMPLICATIONS OF AESTHETIC EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATION:
A Discussion

Implications of Aesthetic Education for Teacher Education
Calvin Lee Pritner.....85

An Interdisciplinary Model in the Arts and Its Implications for Teacher Education
Thomas A. Beagle.....89

GENERAL SESSION: SUMMARY REPORT, AESTHETIC EDUCATION

So, What is Aesthetic Education?
Morris Weitz as "Responder-in-Residence".....93

Foreword

This publication is a report of the proceedings of the Aesthetic Education Center of the 1971 AETA Convention, August 16, 17, and 18 in Chicago. CEMREL, Inc. and AETA are co-sponsors both of the Center and this report. Most sessions of the Center were recorded; for the purposes of this document, these have been transcribed and edited. In some cases, papers were presented; these are included in their entirety. The intent of this document is to reflect the scope of activity, the intensity of dialogue, and how all of this was handled in those exciting days. A further intent of the report is to provide the reader with insights into the challenges of aesthetic education and to stimulate his participation in the continuing dialogue of this rapidly growing area of study.

The opening statement, Aesthetic Education, Key Issue for the Arts in the '70's provides the context for the ensuing discussions..."We must honestly admit that for all of our effort, we have not convinced the public or the people in the schools that the arts are fundamentally important to the human being's growth, development, and self-fulfillment...to build for the future we must make a massive, systematic, and rational exploration of how we can more effectively reach our children, young people, and adults across our culturally and ethnically diversified country, and how we can do this both in the schools and outside of them."

A panel discussion, What is Aesthetic Education? was the Center's first activity. As a participant in the panel, Harlan Hoffa outlined his perception of what aesthetic education is not. As an educational method, he stated, aesthetic education "does not involve learning to be an aesthetician, nor does it even involve learning much about aesthetics...it is not a glorified, related arts program involving equal parts of art, music, theatre, and poetry, each taught as if it were the mortal enemy of the other...it is not

a special kind of humanities course, based upon pre-selected 'great ideas' which are, presumably, common to and definitive of 'great art'...and last, the aesthetic education idea cannot, and must not, be couched in terms which make it a useful adjunct to one or another of the domestic, social, or cultural virtues."

A second panel member, Robert Smith suggested that we decide what aesthetic education is by what we say and do about our discontent with current arts programs. Aesthetic education "implies a proposal that we relate the arts programs in our schools more closely, and in new ways."

Leading with the idea that "the ambience of the instructional situation has greater importance in aesthetic education than does any other factor," panelist Burnet Hobgood discussed six points which he believes are germane to the issue: "...that there be intensity of experience in the situation... that to achieve intensity of experience the curriculum or the work of study being developed should be centered in problems having to do with the artist and his art form...that central to intense educational experience are teachers with provocative attitudes toward students...that there must be encouragement of criticism...that we require a progress on the part of the student if he is to continue...that the inter-relationships of the arts are important."

Following Hobgood's expansion of his six points, Morris Weitz, "Responder-in-Residence" for the Aesthetic Education Center, moderated a general discussion of the panel topic. The selections from this general discussion incorporated in this report evidence the range of questions and intensity of that discussion.

At the next presentation of the Center three major aesthetic education efforts currently being developed and implemented and having an impact on thousands of people around the country were outlined. One of these efforts, the Rhode Island Arts in Education Project, advances its main purpose as setting up and administering "through systematic interaction between the schools and the professional arts community, in-service education models in the various

arts fields for teachers." The presentation outlined more detailed objectives for the total project as well as for teacher and student workshops. It went on to describe the Project's Educational Drama Program.

To make the arts an integral part of the general education of every child in a school system is a major objective of the JDR 3rd Fund's Arts in Education Program as described next. This description focused on three pilot projects--in University City, Missouri; Public School 51, New York; and Mineola, New York. The projects are designed to complement existing art programs and to stimulate more comprehensive programs which would include all of the arts as part of the total curriculum rather than "as specialized subjects which attract students with particular talents."

The Aesthetic Education Program of CEMREL, Inc., is designing a curricular system of modular resources or learning packages for youngsters K-3. The paper, presented to the Aesthetic Education Center and included in this report, outlines the Program's goals, describes some of the instructional units, discusses the development process, and presents activities involving teacher education. It explains the program's goal of providing the child with experiences, via the program's materials, which should enhance the child's aesthetic sensibilities so he may more fully experience the aesthetic qualities of life and make judgments regarding his own life based on aesthetic criteria.

The document of the session Evaluation for Aesthetic Education: A Discussion represents three hours intensive searching to perceive a process of evaluation and its relationship to aesthetic education in general and theatre in particular. In editing the transcript of this session, the intent was to capture the dimensions of the participants' struggle and to point up the possibilities and potential of an approach to evaluation. Asahel Woodruff began by indicating that "about the only kinds of outcomes that we can in any sense at all evaluate, no matter how you define that term, are things that you can see...some form of behavior." He suggested that an approach to this problem

is to carefully define the critical properties of, e.g. the actor; i.e. what the actor actually does when he is performing. A list of these behaviors can form a basis for developing criteria for evaluating the actor's performance. Jack Davis, in a later part of the discussion, warned that "we are prone in the arts to take a sort of fatalistic approach to evaluatuion, in that we don't want to measure anything unless we can measure the ultimate." Davis went on to outline the model worked up for developing CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program. George Gunkle and David Addington then led the entire group in attempting to list some of those behaviors which constitute acting. The remainder of the discussion and debate reveals the strenuous work involved in defining aspects of theatre for concrete, objective evaluation.

The last day of the convention brought the focus of the Aesthetic Education Center to the Implications of Aesthetic Education for Teacher Education. Calvin Pritner cogently discussed the "process-product" dilemma of teaching. Pritner expressed his concern that over-emphasis on educational process "almost to the exclusion of product...could become an excuse for mediocrity in theatre education." He also pursued the role of the teacher as an "agent" of learning "who directly affects the educational experience of the student." Following Pritner, Thomas Beagle presented An Interdisciplinary Model in the Arts and Its Implication for Teacher Education. His three-dimensional model suggests a process approach to learning. Beagle also raised the provocative question, "And how do we teach teachers how to teach man how to learn" in an interdisciplinary arts program?

As "Responder-in-Residence," Morris Weitz concluded the Aesthetic Education Center's activities at the convention by presenting his paper, So What is Aesthetic Education?, to a general session of the AETA membership. While Weitz warned that a definition of aesthetic education is impossible, he stated his perception of "its great goal: the enhancement of the full growth of the child in which the aesthetic...as open as that term is... would achieve at least an equal status with the intellectual." Weitz went on to relate the importance of aesthetic education to three types of children

"which indeed encompass every child": (1) the underprivileged, (2) the undereducated, and (3) the underperceptive." Finally he energetically discussed the need for aesthetic articulation. "For it is not enough to bring children to feel, see, imagine, experience. They must also be taught to speak, to make clear what they experience."

This report, then, attempts to bring together what was articulated (sometimes aesthetically) in the Aesthetic Education Center of the 1971 AETA Convention. It is intended to stimulate dialogue which, in turn, should raise crucial questions which, in their own turn, will demand relevant answers and action.

Aesthetic Education: Key Issue for the Arts in the 1970s

Bernard S. Rosenblatt

It has been a great privilege to serve as Chairman of the Aesthetic Education Center for this convention and it is gratifying that the Program Committee saw fit to highlight aesthetic education. I am also deeply honored to have been asked to speak for a few moments at this keynote session. The Aesthetic Education Center will address itself to four key topics: 1) What is Aesthetic Education?; 2) A Look at Some Programs Currently Being Developed in this Area; 3) Evaluation for Aesthetic Education; and 4) Implications for Teacher Education. We are also introducing a new feature in having one individual serve as a "Responder-in-Residence" who will report back to this convention on Wednesday his summary of observations of our proceedings. We are most pleased to have an individual serve in this capacity who embodies the spirit of the true scholar and gentleman, a professor of philosophy at Brandeis who is familiar to many of you, Dr. Morris Weitz.

With your permission, then, Mr. President, I would like to briefly attempt to place the proceedings of the Aesthetic Education Center into its context.

We are all well aware that this convention marks a significant step in the maturation of our professional Association. I mean, of course, our efforts in structurally changing our Association. It seems to many people that as professionals we must also look to other developments during our maturation, for structural change in and of itself could be meaningless.

We have in the past couple of years examined our "structural consciences" as structural change of the Association has been debated. It seems we can do no less with our content. Needless to say, this self-examination must not only take place within theoretical bounds but also within practical limits.

We all agree, I am sure, that arts experiences are an important aspect of something we call "the quality of life" and that theatre can make a unique contribution to that life. But to how many people in our society are we

relating at the present moment? How many children are engaged in creative dramatics and exposed to children's theatre in our elementary schools? How many students are engaged in some kind of arts program in junior high schools and senior high schools? The Peluso Report has provided us with some insights along this dimension. How many students in the colleges and universities are engaged in some kind of arts curricula and activities? How many members of the communities-at-large are engaged in some kinds of arts activities--as practitioners and audiences? Are we satisfied with these numbers and the quality of experiences these people receive? Have we developed a population with an aroused aesthetic sensibility? Are we indeed contributing to the quality of life of all the people?

It is quite clear that schools and communities are not, with some exceptions, spending inordinate amounts of energy and money on the arts. While we have witnessed enough wholesale elimination of arts programs to make us shudder, we can all attest to some quantitative and qualitative progress--but far less than is our potential. We must honestly admit that, for all of our effort, we have not convinced enough of the public or the people in the schools that the arts are fundamentally important to the human being's growth, development, and self-fulfillment. I submit that to build for the future we must make a massive, systematic, and rational exploration of how we can more effectively reach our children, young people, and adults across our culturally and ethnically diversified country, and how we can do this both in the schools and outside of them.

More and more one hears from educators all across the country that if the arts are to survive in the schools they must come together and work in a unified way to demonstrate how they relate to the general goals of education, how they can reach a majority of the students, and how they can make contributions that are unique and not possible in any other area of the curriculum. There are those who believe that something can be done to answer this challenge and some of the suggestions which have been offered are:

1. Bring the arts people together within disciplines and across disciplines. This does not mean the loss of identity of any of the arts nor the sublimation of any of the arts.

2. Once the people in the arts can perceive that their survival, particularly perhaps in education, may rest on their coming together, then all must sit down and attend to some fundamental issues:
   a. What have we really accomplished in the last years in arts education? Have we built a population that demands theatre, art, music, dance? Have we built a population with a strong aesthetic sensibility?
   b. Can we honestly demonstrate that we have enhanced human sensitivity and interpersonal interaction?
   c. Can we honestly demonstrate that we have enhanced divergent thinking? Do we, who are educated in the arts, demonstrate the above qualities?
   d. Have we attended to the goals of general education and the goals of the community and attempted to learn "their" language or have we been "strangers in a strange land?" Have we, as specialists, tried to meet the layman at least halfway or have we carefully tended to guard our "secrets" and maintain the "mystique of the arts"?
   e. How many people compared to the total population have we involved in our programs?
   f. What kind of empirical evidence can we present that shows the difference we make in the lives of those who engage in arts activities?

There are, obviously, many other questions and many points of view with which to be concerned.

However, one concept which seems to be addressing itself to these issues and seems to be growing among educators across the country is that education ought to at least be able to enhance the aesthetic sensibilities of the population--that people should be able to make aesthetic judgments about the arts and the general environment. It seems that as one talks with educators--and I mean superintendents, people from state departments of education, curriculum specialists, principals--the one point for potential rallying of these people is around aesthetic education. In the last two years I've had the privilege of speaking with many of these educators, and the one concept for the arts which seems to have a real

chance is aesthetic education geared for all the students--an education which deals with underlying concepts which cut across the arts, but which do not attempt to unnaturally amalgamate the arts--such an education holds the arts as exemplars of the aesthetic!

Some dimensions of aesthetic education will be explored the next few days at our convention. The NAEA and MENC have already conducted similar investigations. You will have an opportunity to look at some major programs which are exploring this area of aesthetic education and are now actively influencing school people. These programs are, or soon will be, tested and accepted in many states across the country, e.g. Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Illinois, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wisconsin.

And finally, I ask you to think about the implication of this--if 80% of the children in this country were to have some experience and education with clearly defined goals and objectives in all of the arts while they attend K-6, what would this do for children's theatre, for the high school teacher, for the college teacher, for the community theatres, for the repertory theatres--not to mention the classroom teachers in K-6? It is possible for children to have this kind of experience or education, and it is already beginning to happen. It can happen at a more rapid rate if all of us dare to think in alternative modes of reaching education. I think if you ponder these implications you will agree that aesthetic education is a key issue for the arts in the'70's. The Aesthetic Education Center looks forward to engaging as many of you as possible in this most important dialogue.

Thank you.

What Aesthetic Education Isn't

Harlan Hoffa

It is a great deal easier for me to speak about what aesthetic education is not than it is for me to talk about what it is. Unfortunately, however, it would take years to list all of the various things it isn't, and, even then, I am not at all certain that what remains would represent an acceptable working definition of aesthetic education. Permit me to elaborate on a few of the more common misconceptions about aesthetic education at the outset, however, before I proceed to some more constructive concerns. This may seem to be a negative approach, but, if so, I can only say in my own defense, that I am not constitutionally opposed to negativism. And I would point out that history is on my side in this regard. Even Moses, when he came down from Mount Sinai with those stone tablets tucked under his robe, phrased the words of God in a negative way. He did not say, "Live and let live;" he said, "Thou shalt not kill." And he did not mince words about marital infidelity; he said, "Thou shalt not commit adultry," and he avoided the fine distinctions between larceny, burglary and robbery; he said simply, "Thou shalt not steal." If I had the time, and if I had the mind for it, and, most importantly, if I had the nerve, I might try to spell out the ten commandments of aesthetic education (brought down from O'Hare Airport on mimeograph paper instead of from the Mount writ in stone). But, circumstances being what they are, perhaps I should settle for only a few, rather more mild statements. Commandments are out of style these days, anyway, and so are prophets.

There are at least four things which I believe aesthetic education is not, but which are, unfortuantely, commonly confused with--or mislabeled as--aesthetic education as I understand it. First, aesthetic education does not involve learning to be an aesthetician nor does it even involve learning much about aesthetics. Second, aesthetic education is not a glorified, related-arts program involving equal parts of art, music, theatre, and

poetry, each taught as if it were the mortal enemy of the other. Third, it is not a special kind of humanities course, based upon pre-selected "great ideas" which are, presumably, common to and definitive of "great art." Fourth and last, the aesthetic education idea cannot, and must not, be couched in terms which make it a useful adjunct to one or another of the domestic, social, or cultural virtues. I would like to elaborate briefly on each of these points.

My first statement about aesthetic education was that it did not involve learning to be an aesthetician, and this is, of course, a fairly simplistic statement. Not many fields of education would openly admit that they are engaged in pre-professional or pre-vocational training, except perhaps at the university level. Most subjects do have a substantive base from which to work, however. Science education refers to its parent scientific disciplines for content; art education is geared to the study of art in its various manifestations; and even physical education has referents in the rules of games or the canons of form to guide it. Aesthetic education, however, (at least in its present form) is almost entirely innocent of any association with aesthetic theory, and it has certainly not been contaminated by the behavioral models which aestheticians might have provided. In short, aesthetic education has very little to do with aesthetics as it is studied and practiced by aestheticians. Art education may be to art as science education is to science, but aesthetic education is not related in that way to aesthetics.

My second comment referred to related-arts programs--those academic steeplechases which march herds of students in lockstep formation past four art forms in 16 weeks: I said that this, too, was not aesthetic education primarily because such programs rarely offer much of an opportunity to learn about the arts and they almost never stimulate aesthetic insights. Whatever else aesthetic education may or may not be, it must, I believe, pluck at the feelings to make them twang. Unfortunately, related-arts courses rarely have this effect. In fact, they rarely succeed in establishing the promised inter-relationship between the arts either, since the several arts are all

too often taught in total isolation from each other. Even when a relationship between the arts is established, however, it usually represents conceptual learning about art rather than an education of the senses or of feeling; and I cannot conceive of an aesthetic education which does not emphasize the responsive capabilities of the learner.

The third thing which I said was that aesthetic education isn't a glorified humanities course relating to great ideas or great art or both. Robert Hutchins, the former president of the University of Chicago touted the great ideas approach in liberal education, and Charles Keller, directed the John Hays Fellows program for the retraining of teachers in high school humanities courses. Both contributed to the survival of humanistic learning in the schools of our technological society and I do not demean their contributions in the least. I must argue strenuously, however, with those all too common efforts to define aesthetic education as an offshoot of the humanities movement; especially when these efforts are rooted in the "great ideas" tradition. Great ideas do not make great art, and art works which are especially selected because they seem to mirror great ideas may not be great at all. Even if there were a relationship between great ideas and great art, however, it does not necessarily follow that a great work of art will evoke an aesthetic response which is consistent with its merit as a work of art. Works of art are great for many reasons--not all of which relate directly to their aesthetic qualities--and, when they are selected primarily to be illustrations of great ideas, they are almost certain to be remote from the aesthetic domain.

That aesthetic education cannot serve as an instrument to other educational, social, or cultural goals was my fourth point. I may be overstating the case but I believe aesthetic education must be essentially useless--useless, at least, in terms of the pragmatic goals and instrumental methods which are commonly accepted in education. Aesthetic education isn't good for anything--except itself. The bedrock

upon which almost all aesthetic theory rests in that of intrinsic value--that certain objects or events have evocative qualities which exist independent of their utility. The great pyramid of Cheops in Egypt was built as a royal tomb; the Parthenon was originally a temple complex; and the prints of Hogarth were propaganda pieces in much the same vein as the novels of Dickens. Yet, we now value these works for their intrinsic qualities, and we need not be loyal subjects to the Pharaohs, faithful believers in Apollo or Zeus, or especially concerned with 19th century social problems to respond to them.

The puritan ethic has been with us for a long time and the sancity of work, which is a part of that ethic, has ramifications which are both persistent and inherently destructive to the idea that something can be both valued and useless at the same time. There are signals all around us which suggest that our values may be changing. The ecology movement is an example. But the battle is far from over and I suspect that it will be many years before wildflowers take precedence over oil wells. We have only recently come to the point where there was any public outrage over the slaughter of eagles in the interest of selling lamb chops. Eagles and wildflowers and paintings and poems are essentially useless things, if compared with gasoline in the tank or meat on the table; but they are not valueless to the human condition and God help us if we should ever lose sight of this distinction. That is what I mean about aesthetic education being useless--and that is precisely why it must be valued.

These things, then, represent one man's conception of what aesthetic education is <u>not</u>, though obviously they have not done much to explain what it is--except indirectly--but maybe that is a sculptor's way. There is a famous story about a sculptor who was asked how to carve a marble elephant. He said, "just cut away everything that doesn't look like an elephant." That is essentially what I have tried to do in defining our topic this morning--to cut away some of the things which do not look like aesthetic education in the hope that what remains may show some of the broad outlines of what aesthetic education really is.

When the concept for a large-scale, curriculum development effort in aesthetic education was first launched early in 1967, I was working in the Arts and Humanities Program of the U.S. Office of Education; and, because that agency was instrumental in setting into motion the effort in aesthetic education, I may be able to cast some historical light on what aesthetic education meant at that time. We did not speak so much then of aesthetic education as of the aesthetic element in education--or of the aesthetic mode of education. There was no discussion of a specific body of content, nor of a course of study, nor of teaching packages. In fact, the original conception was one which sought to capitalize on aesthetic experiences wherever they might exist--in the purity of a mathematical model, in an elegantly solved chess problem, in the feel of a beach pebble, or in the sound of a surf...in science, in sports, in the grandeur of the cosmic universe, or in the delicacy of a blossom. It was recognized that the arts, more than most aspects of human endeavor, put a premium upon aesthetic qualities and that the arts would, almost inevitably, become a central element in the development task--a central element but not the element. For a variety of reasons, however, the current work on aesthetic education has been concentrated almost wholly in the visual, performing, and literary arts. I find this regrettable, even though I understand some of the reasons for it. I believe that this approach limits the scope of what aesthetic education might be, that it softens the impact which aesthetic values could have upon American education, and, last but not least, that it so weakens the curriculum development effort in aesthetic education as to make it unnecessarily vulnerable.

In brief then, aesthetic education has, I believe, become a vehicle for arts educators rather than an educational method, and I am terribly afraid that the frailties and the weaknesses and the self delusions of art educators and music educators and dance educators and, probably, even theatre educators will be passed along in the bloodstream of aesthetic education like a genetic defect unless it can be strengthened by a transfusion from those other arenas of human endeavor which may also rightly claim to have elegant and beautiful and moving aspects.

Let me close with a definition of aesthetics which was offered by a contemporary American painter named Barnett Newman. He said, "Aesthetics is for artists as ornithology is for the birds." I do not necessarily subscribe wholly to that definition--though I must confess that I find it candid and full of insight--but it does illustrate the dangers of placing all of our aesthetic eggs in the educational basket of the arts.

On the Question: What Is Aesthetic Education?

Robert C. Smith

One way to get at a question like What is aesthetic education? is to look at how such a question might arise and in what context. If someone asks, "Where is the Beverly Room?"* you can cope with a question like that very easily. You either know or you don't know. You can give an answer or not--and you can give a right answer or a wrong answer. What is aesthetic education? does not call for information, but rather a definition. But before we venture toward a definition, we might do well to ask Why is one needed? What purpose might it serve?

I think the question What is aesthetic education? has arisen in this manner. In a time of change many people become doubtful about the value of what they are doing and the effectiveness of the way they are doing it. In teaching the arts in schools we have been increasingly troubled by questions like: Are our programs in art, music and theatre related to each other properly--or at all? How should our programs be related to the arts as practiced outside the schools--to the popular culture, to art works of the past, to the avant-garde? Are we reaching all the people we should be reaching? Are there invidious class distinctions built into our schools that determine whom we reach, regardless of talents and interests? Implicit in such questions, which express our doubt and discontent, are the general questions: What purposes are we serving? and, more pointedly, Whose purposes are we serving?

Once people start asking such questions there are inevitably some answers offered. Some people have summed up their answers in the general statement that we are all--rather, we all should be, committed to aesthetic education.

---

*The room in which the meeting took place

12 Smith

Suddenly there is a lot of discussion about aesthetic education, most of it not at all conclusive, and at some point in the discussion it occurs to someone that the way to clear up differences and misunderstandings is to agree on what aesthetic education is, once and for all.

When people start to define the term, each person's definition is, either explicitly or implicitly, a set of proposals or recommendations about what we should be doing. We don't get the same definition from everyone. So the attempt to define the term "aesthetic education" leads directly to the original differences from which a definition was to rescue us.

My feeling, then, is that the only way to cope with the question What is aesthetic education? is to go directly to the questions expressing our concrete doubt and discontent--the questions that brought the term into being in the first place. And I believe it is a mistake to try to deal with them all at once--at least for the present.

In our answers to these hard questions--both the answers we propose in words and the answers we act out in practice--we are deciding what aesthetic education is. We don't start with a definition and then bring practices into conformance. We make the definition of "aesthetic education" by what we do.

The term takes on two functions. First, it is commendatory. When someone says, "That's real aesthetic education in my book," he is saying, "That's what we ought to be doing in the schools." Second, it is hortatory. When someone says, "We are all engaged in aesthetic education," he is implying that we have one enterprise in common and also implying that the various arts have some fundamental principles and values in common.

What difference does it make, then, to drag in a term, "aesthetic education," which hasn't been current? I think that the very use and promulgation of the term "aesthetic education" implies a proposal that we relate the arts programs

in our schools more closely and in new ways--it implies that our efforts are directed away from our common purpose. When I urge you to conceive of your job as a teacher under the concept denoted by the term "aesthetic education," I imply that you should change your practices. This is the purpose the term "aesthetic education" now serves.

So, I think if we insist now on an agreed-upon definition the discussion will bog down rather quickly. But if we start with the notion that we will define the term by what we urge on practitioners in our schools as aesthetic education, we can have some fruitful discussion centered on the meaning of "aesthetic education."

Aesthetic Learning Environment

Burnet Hobgood

Robert Edmund Jones in that work that most of us here are familiar with, The Dramatic Imagination, spoke of Max Reinhardt's theory of lighting design. He said Reinhardt explained that when you are designing light for a play, you put it where you want it and you take it away where you don't want it. That is one of the nice things about light--you can do that with it. I think that, because of what we have heard this morning, some of the light has been taken away from where we don't want it. I would like to try to focus some light where I, at any rate, would like it to be. It seems to me that to many of us in theatre this subject of aesthetic education is a comparatively new concern. In the Journal of Aesthetic Education and in the other activities that relate to this question, I have seen very few writings or reflections from people whose principal qualifications in the arts lay in the realm of theatre. So, I would, as the theatre person on this panel, like to work in terms of a flexible notion, yet a distinct one, and work first from a proposition (a general proposition) which seems to me to be very interesting. I would like to propose for your consideration the thought that the ambience of the instructional situation has greater importance in aesthetic education than does any other factor. In other words, if the learning environment is conducive to the learning or perception of those values which we wish to pursue, this will be more instrumental in affecting a student's life and sensibilities than any other factor involved.

It seems to me that, particularly the way things happen in America, a great deal of attention goes to such factors as planning physical facilities and developing curricula. And it's an irony to me that there is often, at least to my knowledge, very little practice concerned with designing an atmosphere appropriate to learning of the perceptions of

value in art. As one student, working in an undergraduate program in theatre told me, "I might as well be in the law or business school. There is not an atmosphere in this situation which would make me think that it has anything to do with the arts." I would just like to pursue that a bit by speaking negatively of what sometimes occurs when predominance is given to what is often described as "very practical matters"--such practical matters as planning physical facilities and developing curricula. I don't deny the necessity of these concerns to the learning situation, but they have too much importance.

I have often been aware that there are teachers who advocate creativity and then provide a highly restrictive situation for their students. In these cases, it seems to me that the student learns to expect that when he engages in creative efforts, there will be stern restrictions over which he has no control. And there are also teachers who say they are pursuing beauty and truth but what is evident in their instructional practice is a grand illustration of what we often call kitsch. Students of these teachers will learn that kitsch is art. Teachers who preach freedom in inquiry and then, by their own methods, in effect muffle critical voices, teach their students to think in terms of conformity. I could go on with such examples, but you see what I mean. With the best intentions, persons will advocate things that are related to what we could conceive of as aesthetic education but practice something which is opposite to that.

I think it is possible to make some suggestions for creating a situation that would actually lend itself to aesthetic education. The first thing that seems necessary to me is that there be intensity of experience in the situation. Intensity of experience in the learning situation will not occur unless the work being undertaken is challenging and unless that challenging work is continuously offered. We don't have this kind of intensity in terms of theatre. For example, one production one semester and another the next semester are the chief things that are challenging opportunities. They need to be continuously

offered with diverse challenges to the students. Involvement in challenges is the rule, because this will enable us to see those students who can proceed to further perception and accomplishment and also to see which students will be able to engage in the disciplines for the practicing artist eventually.

Then secondly, it seems to me that to achieve intensity of experience the curriculum or the work of study being developed should be centered in problems having to do with the artist and his art form. I would prefer as a teacher and as a commentator on the work of teachers to see work planned around important problems for which fresh solutions must be discovered. In the arts I don't think the answers are really in the back of the book. An interesting way to proceed might be with problems which are carefully identified and approached in a sense of sharing--teachers and students sharing together in the discovery of probable and plausible solutions--I am prejudiced in favor of this particular idea. Often in curriculum building we get into something where there is a certain amount of information of data which must be consumed or covered. As a result the educational process is not one of perception, but one of memorization of data and strategies. This, to my mind, does not constitute an aesthetic education. The awareness of the individual student will not be awakened if he is so busy memorizing that he cannot really perceive.

And of course central to intense educational experience is a third thing that I would suggest: teachers with provocative attitudes toward students. In the arts it seems to me the teacher is more a model than he is in the other disciplines. I have frequently been aware of teachers whose model was either that of a dilettante in regard to a particular art form or a drone, and I find that, as unlikely as it may seem zoologically, drones beget drones and dilettantes beget dilettantes. So aesthetic education, to add to Professor Hoffa's list of what aesthetic education is not, is not engaged in the production of dilettantes or drones. As I was suggesting a moment ago, I would like to see it understood that in aesthetic education what we are talking about are teachers who are sharing the educational process, who are

not authoritarians proclaiming what is truth, and so on. I am a little tired in many ways of what can sometimes be called resident authorities.

It seems to me that if the problems of a course are challenging and if the teacher is sharing the educational experience with the students, then what must be going on is a fourth attribute of a program in which there is concern for aesthetic education. Beyond the conveying of other kinds of learning, there must be encouragement of criticism--evaluation of the things that are happening within the program as well as those outside it and evaluation of what is happening with the students and the teachers. When I speak of encouragement of criticism I mean not only the idea of criticizing what has recently occurred in a film, for instance, with which we have no connection and, therefore, no vulnerability when we come to speak of it, nor only the idea of tearing apart the work of someone else. I mean also discussing what we ourselves have done. It is a little more difficult to speak of that. It seems to me that I have never known an artist who was not an individualist; I have never known an artist who is satisfied completely with his own work. Students need to understand these qualities of artists and understand whether they themselves will be artists or not. A friend of mine has said that when you speak about that sort of thing you are talking about reinforcing civil rights of students. I think in the evaluative process of programs, students and teachers ought to be sharing that process if only to illustrate that it is awfully hard to satisfy the artist and his individuality.

In speaking to ideas that might apply in a more flexible way and over a broader continuum of education, I think that an aesthetic education should really require a progress on the part of the student if he is to continue. Our educational system, especially in America, seems to be full of "passmen," full of an ethic of passing on people because we are being generous or kind to them when it is not really wise or ethical for the teachers to let that happen. I think that the awareness, sensibility, and ability of a student to practice a craft increases as he learns and understands himself better. There are stages through which he must pass to come to higher and higher

degrees of capability. It seems to me that the teacher should meet the student where he is, where he lives, and with what he knows and take him from one stage of development into the next, which means that the teacher who has not thought about the learning process is probably not a very good teacher. Our inheritance in theatre, for example, and I won't speak in relation to the other arts, is from the conservatory traditions of Europe and represents the imitative method of teaching. The great actor teaches his apprentice how to play the roles the way he played them. Most of our teaching is of that order and, to my mind, is not very interesting from the student's standpoint. Further, it is less likely to be a part of what we might call aesthetic education.

Next and last of my six points is my feeling that the inter-relationships of the arts are important. In such an approach, one is not committed to one <u>form</u> of the arts--one is committed to an <u>interest</u> in the arts, an alertness to what is occurring in them, and a concern for not only the established forms of artistic expression but for the new forms that are struggling to find shape and a place for themselves.

These six things are suggestions I would make as to how you would try to work toward a design of an atmosphere, an ambience, in which the learning process that we are referring to as aesthetic education could take place. It is more important that there is a receptivity, an openness, a feeling of criticism, a sharing on the part of teachers and students than it is to have prescriptions fulfilled, data memorized and learned. Designs which will will make for an intensive learning experience on the part of the students will do that thing which I believe is the shortest, but yet the best, definition of education, that is to say, change the people who are part of the process.

A person who is unchanged as a result of being in a situation where he is supposed to be learning has not learned. If you want to have another efficient way of providing an aesthetic education and a process which would create the sort of atmosphere I've attempted to describe, I can only suggest that you get a group of gifted industrious, very articulate, interested, and concerned artists; put them together with students in one place; stand by and just watch what happens.

Panel-Audience Dialogue

Weitz: I am going to open the discussion now and ask for questions. Please address your questions to the individual speakers on the panel.

Question: Would you suggest that aesthetic education is perhaps an educational process as opposed to a discipline having a content of its own? Or are both involved?

Hobgood: I know that it has a content. I was suggesting that the process is more important than the product--what happens to the person is more important than what he is able to do at a particular point with respect to aesthetic education. I am involved myself in a professional training program so I am concerned about the product, but I think that the process is what we are overlooking in theatre education.

Question: How can you build aesthetic education into curriculum--where does it fit into general education?

Hoffa: I think in a good many instances we have to settle for the existing related-arts courses or whatever else is available as the vehicle. I think, however, that it is basically not so much a curriculum matter. It is an attitude toward the educational process. Let me give you an example. The astronauts who were on the moon were superbly trained not only physically and in terms of their technological skill in getting up there and back again but also as observers. They were able to define and describe the rock samples they had found with such precision that the geologists back on earth had a fairly good picture of what it was they were speaking of, and all of us who heard their conversations were impressed with this.

In terms of this kind of perception they were very well trained, but I couldn't help but notice that those highly refined skills which had been drilled into them were overcome by their immediate responses. There was that "gee whiz" aspect as they stepped out of the capsule and picked up the rock. The attitude I'd like to see as part of the educational process basically capturing and capitalizing on and valuing not only the ability to describe in geological terms what a thing is that you have in your hands--or whatever else it is that is outside your skin that you are perceiving--but also believing that there is something intrinsically worthwhile in simply the "wow" or "gee whiz" experience. This attitude is one of valuing the response to a piece of music, the response to theatre, the response to a painting, without regard for any kind of definitive, descriptive, curricula aspect. I am sure that the same thing happens in all the sciences. A technician in a laboratory can, I'm sure, not only be careful that he doesn't blow up a laboratory with wrong chemicals but also perhaps, if trained in the right way, build upon his experience so that purple stuff bubbling up and down is enjoyable for its own sake. The lights flashing in the computer bank can be valuable as a light show as well as for a readout from the computer. I would say that in my estimation the idea of aesthetic education has to go beyond the arts.

Question: What were you referring to when you said that aesthetic education will be defined by what we do?

Smith: Well, I think what I am saying is aesthetic education is the kind of concept that is open in the sense that aesthetic education is what you conceive it to be and what I conceive it to be, and as our conceptions coincide and as other conceptions coincide a workable concept ensues. I think we are moving toward it now, but it will never be entirely closed. The term mammal has a whole set of characteristics and these are the characteristics of mammals, period. In other words aesthetic education is not a

classification type of term, and it is going to have a changing meaning depending on what we say and do, i.e. we who are involved.

Hobgood: You mean you are being eclectic about it?

Smith: No, I am not being eclectic because I know what it ought to be; yet, I am not at all sure I know exactly what it ought to be.

Hobgood: Then we are not in dispute in that I think we ought to have a great deal more interest in the process and not so much concern about the product. If we have a good process we will have a good product. But I see so many people nervous about that.

Smith: I think there is a lot to the strategy you suggest. If we fix our attention on the product and we start doing the kinds of things you say; if we start saying one thing but doing another; if we are planning to be very creative and then do something else; the cause may be that we are not looking at the process.

Question: Are we doing things backward?

Hoffa: This is what I suggested in a very glancing way in reference to the clues that seem to be about us now--the ecology movement, the counterculture and so forth--there are a number of suggestions from the young people and their world which suggest they are putting a premium on experience for its own sake rather than experience as an instrument to some goal which exists out there somewhere.

Question: The future is here now.

Hoffa: This is a generation which has grown up with the threat of atomic bomb over their heads. They can't afford to look into a future which may not exist. They are concerned with the immediacy

24 Panel-Audience Dialogue

of an experience--an experience that has intrinsic worth not an instrumental worth. This is the essence of an aesthetic experience, one that has intrinsic worth.

Question: An awareness of an experience.

Hoffa: Wherever it may exist.

Question: Are we not obliquely indicating our own grasp of the aesthetic experience as we work it out professionally? Perhaps we have to look at that side of the coin.

Smith: I think this is true. We probably have a great many people involved in teaching of the arts who are incapable of an aesthetic experience of a very high order or who have gone stale in one way or another. I don't think that a really fine perception on the part of the teacher guarantees success in improving perception of the student. It is one condition toward that goal, but I don't think it is a sufficient and necessary condition; it doesn't guarantee results.

Question: Maybe I didn't quite make my point. I was not thinking of the individual teacher and his perceptions. What I was thinking of was the quality of the individual activity in the art. It seems to me that when the student sees the relationship between a person and what he is doing, it is at that point that he grasps the content of what happens. And if the relationship between the practitioners of the art and their work is of a shaky order, then I don't think that there is any question but that this is what the student perceives as the artistic act. I guess what I am suggesting is that the central content of what art is emerges from the relationship of the individual toward what he does. One of the ways of grasping this is to see the whole relationship. Perhaps we ought to work more on clarifying that relationship for ourselves with the idea that then the whole thing will become

visible to students and they in turn can progress from that kind of insight. My concern, then, is that rather than articulate philosophies and strategies about working with students and pretending that we have some kind of corner on the aesthetic market, we ought to examine in some very fundamental way how the grasp of the relationship between the artist and his work may come about. A clear understanding of this might result in a whole different environment.

Weitz: Are you in a way suggesting that we have to consider in this whole business of aesthetic education sort of integrity of craftmanship which is exemplified in the teaching process and which has nothing especially to do with what we have here centered on as this "wow" experience response? I like this point because it does seem to me it presents a kind of healthy polarity which is especially relevant to this sort of convention. But there is an integrity of craftmanship, technique, and performance which has got to come in in any total conception of aesthetic education and which hasn't yet come in because of the concentration on provocative responses to the object presented.

Question: That is a facet of the point. In other words what you spelled out is one evidence of the integrity of a larger process relationship between a person and what he is doing. Certainly that is a facet of what I was saying.

Hoffa: It strikes me that the relationship of the individual to what he is doing exists in other realms of activities besides the arts, and I would like to see the hallowness of this relationship become a behavioral model not only for education in the arts but for education wherever it may exist for the guy who does a good job in anything. My mechanic when I lived in Boston would say, when I asked how my car was, "It's beautiful."

26 Panel-Audience Dialogue

He didn't say it ran very smoothly. He said it was beautiful and he meant it because he knew what he was doing and he was proud of it. This is the kind of affective response, whether it existed in the arts or elsewhere, which I would say is the bedrock of aesthetic education and not simply something which exists and is personified in the visual, performing, or literary arts.

Hobgood: I am stimulated by this exchange to observe that it seems to me a very important part of aesthetic education is that the people who are the craftsmen or teachers or whatever we call them, who are involved in the leading of this process should be a community who share many things in common. We are social, we need to have the kind of relationship to our work that you are speaking of, we need to have confirmation or other reaction from our colleagues, and we won't get it unless we are a community. And in so many cases, I know of facilities that aren't in any sense a community and cannot respond to each other at all.

Question: I find it so exciting to hear people getting aesthetics out of the realm of subject matter. It seems to me that what you are coming up with in one way or another is that aesthetic education means a demand to overcome the inertia which would make us content with less than the best. It is the demand for the spirit rather the letter.

Question: Maybe, talking about the affective and the cognitive, instead of seeing them as parallel tracks could we see them at right angles to one another so that there is an affective element in every single thing?

Question: I may be alone but I still don't know what aesthetic education is. The closet thing is when Professor Hoffa is talking about this "wow" experience, but I am sure you would agree that everybody

is going to have a "wow" experience. I think that in aesthetic education you would want to do something about the "wow" experience. Would it be unfair to ask what do you want to do about the "wow" experience?

Hoffa: I am not sure that it would be unfair but it probably would be kind of fruitless. I am not really sure that I can answer for anybody except myself, and I can't really answer for myself under all circumstances. If I am working with a graduate student, let's say in an advanced stage of his doctoral program, then the phrasing or writing of the dissertion in a way that has a little more poetry and a little less of a Sears Roebuck catalog description, might be the tack I would take. I don't know of a single answer except that which exists in terms of my relationship to an individual and my relationship to an object or an event. If I strap a camera around my neck and go out into the woods and see the world in the woods through the viewfinder, then that is an aesthetic experience. If I am going out in the woods looking for blueberries, and I still have a camera around my neck, it is not an aesthetic experience. It is this relationship to an event, to a person, or to an object that is always unique, and perhaps the reason that it is so difficult to define what aesthetic education is, is that it is never the same twice. As soon as we begin to take an artist, for example, as a model of creative behavior and do as the artist did because he is creative, if we do what he did we will be creative also. But the reason we valued what he did is that it was unique, and if we do as he did then it is no longer unique.... This is kind of the way I feel about the whole aesthetic experience--as soon as you try to pin it down you kill it. You take a watch apart to see what makes it tick and it doesn't tick anymore. I don't like saying what I am saying. It is sloppy but, nevertheless, in terms of what is involved for me as an individual in an aesthetic experience, it is never the same twice and, consequently, any definition right now is going to be useless.

28 Panel-Audience Dialogue

Hobgood: I will go with the "con amore" attitude--the zestful enjoyment of what is going on. If that isn't occurring it seems to me the thing is really suspect--what is occurring is suspect. I remember last winter I had the privilege of having a scholar give a lecture to our students, and she couldn't have known at the time that shortly before those students had heard a lecture which was completely opposed in its content to what she said. But the reason she made an impact was not exclusively because of the rationality of her argument. It was the commitment she exhibited when she was speaking--that was what I meant by the ambience of the situation. Perhaps the most persuasive element was the beautiful commitment which this scholar had in speaking of this subject, and that is, I think, what we may not give enough attention to. We may not be enthusiastic enough, zestful enough, or really related to the beauty of which we are part.

Question: It seems to me that what we are concerned with in aesthetic education is stripping away layers of pragmatic philosophy that we have developed, especially here in the United States, in order to open the individual up to the intuitive response which creates the "wow."

Question: How do you deal with the aesthetic of a "wow" experience--for instance, the "be-ins" and the "happenings?" Can these be an aesthetic experience of people who live in the now, who experience in the now? How do we get an aesthetic experience or an aesthetic understanding to them so that the aesthetic appreciation won't be in retrospect, so they won't have to sit down after their be-in and say, "What was aesthetic?" Happenings always bother me because they seem to happen to you rather than you happening to the experience. How do you come up with an aesthetics of now?

Weitz: You don't. Without some sense of articulation, knowing what is going on, the "wow" experience isn't going to mean anything. What we really have going here is a confusion between a sort of implicit

definition and some sort of insistence on something that is absolutely necessary. Now Hobgood's point about the necessity of keeping to the affective, to the intense emotional experience is all to the good. Then, having granted that, the whole thing is what you supplement, and here I am in complete agreement with Smith that what we are concerned with is a matter of recommendations of how much we want to put into the package of what goes into the aesthetic. To rule in the beginning that any articulation, any attempt to make clear what's given you this "wow" experience is not aesthetic is the road to disaster. This is what happens with happenings. The happening is anti--anti everything--and indeed it is anti-aesthetic in the sense that it is anti-art--that's part of the "wow" if you like. In fact, here one has to go from the problem of general education as the model for aesthetic education now to sex education. What is the whole point, in fact? Is it to give you a better orgasm or to make you understand what is involved in sex, and who get's taught it anyway? So I mean, in a sense, what we are really worried about here is whether or not sex education, i.e. aesthetic education, should start with the orgasm or come back to it. Or should it teach something about what is involved in the total process. Here the answer is quite clear--we don't have to be taught about process--we want articulation, we want clarity. It's a tragedy that we can send these men to the moon who are absolute philistines except when it comes to the sciences. All they can do is describe quantitatively and say "gee whiz." They can't get any sense of the magnitude, the poetic splendor of what awaits them. That is really your problem in aesthetics--to bridge this terrible gap between the experience and jargonistic talk.

Question: Are you proposing that the purpose of aesthetic education is to get people to be able to articulate about their "wow" experience or to be able to have one? What I think happened on the moon was that they had their "wow" experience, but they weren't very good at articulating it.

30 Panel-Audience Dialogue

Smith: I would like to put one thing in here. Apparently a lot of people have been reading Paul Goodman or somebody very much like him. If we buy that version of what we are doing and, in contrast, what we ought to be doing, what we will have to do is to take the responsibility because this kind of change being suggested is literally to subvert the institutions in which we work. This is so because, if we are going to establish the kind of community that makes aesthetic experiences easily available and make people receptive to them, then we are going to establish real communities. We are going to have to tear up a lot of institutional structures and build them over, and, if we are serious about this, we might as well accept the consequences and start out and do it.

Question: Well, it is pretty well in the cards anyway isn't it? Isn't this what is already happening to our institutions?

Smith: Well, I don't know whether it is happening. There are a lot of people who would like to see it happen and there are lots of cracks around in our instructional structures. But nobody's torn anything down and rebuilt again. This is what we are really talking about.

Arts in Education Project
Rhode Island

Arthur Custer, Raymond Picozzi, Beth Pollock, and Naida Weisberg

The Rhode Island Arts in Education Project was established as a result of a $350,000 grant to the Rhode Island State Council on the Arts by the National Endowment for the Arts and the Arts and Humanities Branch of the United States Office of Education. The grant is forward-funded for three years beginning September, 1970.

Since federal funds are to be matched by state and local resources, the Project represents a partnership at several levels between governmental, educational and community institutions, as well as individual artists. The Project is governed by a special committee appointed by the Rhode Island State Council on the Arts, and is operated by a full-time professional staff.

The purpose of the Project is to set up and administer, through systematic interaction between the schools and the professional arts community, in-service education models in the various arts fields for teachers.

The Project's objectives are as follows:

1. To increase perception and sensitivity through direct experience in the arts.
2. To develop awareness and understanding of the arts.
3. To increase enjoyment of the arts.
4. To stimulate further contact with the arts.
5. To facilitate the use of professional artists and art institutions in the school program.
6. To motivate teachers to make continued use of artists and arts institutions as part of the school curriculum.
7. To capitalize on the humanizing influence of the art experience.

The mechanism established by the Arts in Education Project for the achievement of these outcomes presents the experiences of each educational program in an articulated, sequential format. Each program model is made up of a series of weekly events incorporating workshop activities for teachers, student workshops, and opportunities for both teachers and students to experience the completed art object.

Teacher Workshops are intended to permit:

1. Direct involvement with artists in the making of art.
2. Exploration of media and techniques.
3. Examination of what art is and how it is made.
4. Discussion of artistic concepts and principles in relation to the finished product.
5. Exploration of curricular implications of workshop activities involving professional arts and arts organizations.

Student Workshops provide opportunities for:

1. Hands-on experiences in the arts, under the guidance of professional artists.
2. Experiences which are sequential and developmental.
3. Exploration of the process of artistic invention as a vehicle for understanding the completed object, whatever form that may take.
4. Skill development where appropriate.

Whereas the workshops for both teachers and students deal essentially with process, they are related to activities in which the finished art object is considered: the poem, the painting, the dance performance, the play. The art object--the thing that results from the creative act--is explored both for its own sake and in relation to the artistic experience.

The activites and experiences in each program are designed to achieve an educational matrix substantial enough in scope and content to justify

graduate credit for participating teachers. In each program, small groups of teachers are brought together to work with arts specialists. Teachers are invited to explore the art process by direct participation in the art experience under the guidance of professionals.

When the specialists conduct student workshops in the schools of participating teachers, the classroom becomes a laboratory for the continuation and reinforcement of the teacher's learning experience. In the process, the students are themselves involved in meaningful artistic exploration. In these workshops, the creative artist and the performer interact with teachers and students to make the art process the vehicle for sharper and more profound sensitivity to the work of art. The Arts in Education Project is committed to the development of sensory literacy through direct experiences with the art and the artist.

In developing the programs in the Project's first year, certain guiding principles served as leitmotifs in planning meetings with teachers and arts specialists. The approach, format, and objectives grew out of these principles, which may be summarized as follows:

1. Education in the arts should emphasize the creative process as a means of understanding the art object which results from that process. It is accepted as fact that the art object has greater meaning to those acquainted by experience with the aesthetic act which produced it.
2. Educational programs in the visual arts should provide opportunity for personal interaction with working professional artists, and activities should include working with materials. Experiences for teachers and students should deal with the art object on its own terms and should explore the concepts and principles involved in making art.

3. The educational program in poetry should have the same parameters, with the addition of reading poems verbally. The reading of poems is a way of presenting the art object, and of introducing students and teachers to the poet.
4. In the performing arts, the object created by the artist must be recreated. The performance permits the work to assume a condition as a finished work comparable to an object which is completed by the artist himself in non-performing media. The performance of an art object is in itself the result of a process. Since this process has a bearing on the finished work as presented to an audience, it is an essential part of an educational program in the arts.
5. In theatre, the object which results from the creative process is the play. The play deserves to be understood in the same way that a painting may be understood. Thus, one component of the educational program should deal with dramatic invention. This implies the opportunity for teachers and students to interact with playwrights. Since the finished dramatic state is the theatre performance, students and teachers should also have the opportunity to experience the process by which the object (the play) makes its journey from the page to the stage.
6. Educational programs in music should involve teachers and students in experiences dealing with the process of musical invention. This may be accomplished through interaction with composers. Other activities involving musicians should lead to an understanding of musical performance.
7. Understanding of the dance derives from an awareness of the process of artistic movement, and thus the educational program should offer rich opportunities

for direct, personal involvement of both students and teachers with this art form. Since one of the least understood creative activities is choreography, it should be thoroughly examined in this program.

8. Although film is primarily a visual medium, sound is seldom absent. In its most orthodox form, film also relies on dramatic performance. Since it is thus an art object which involves more than a single medium, it may ultimately be a useful focus for concept-centered educational programs which cross media lines.

Description of Educational Drama Program

In the establishment of the program in educational drama, the Project took note of services to education by three separate but related organizations: The Looking Glass Theatre, !Improvise!, and the Theatre Department of Rhode Island College. The Looking Glass Theatre, an adult company performing improvisationally-motivated theatre pieces for children, has had a wide influence in the schools in the state. Their presentations have been imaginatively conceived so as to maximize the participation of students. The group known as Improvise is made up of four specialists in creative dramatics who have been conducting workshops for teachers and students in elementary schools in Rhode Island. Dr. Raymond Picozzi, Director of Children's Theatre at the College, has been offering workshops in creative dramatics for several years.

The program in educational drama sponsored by the Arts in Education Project grew out of meetings with specialists and school personnel. It was a series of workshop experiences utilizing the services of experienced specialists. The program provided the framework for the systematic deployment of these resources according to a broad educational plan. The sequence of activities, taking place over a fifteen-week period, began with the direct involvement of the participating teachers in creative drama experiences and discussions of the theoretical and educational implications of these experiences for the classroom. When the program moved into the schools of participating

teachers, workshop specialists conducted the first student workshops. As the program continued, the classroom teacher was expected to assume a progressively more active role, since one of the objectives of this program, in addition to those established for the total project, was skill development in the handling of drama in education. The final three workshops in the sequence were intended to reinforce that learning.

The introduction of a performance by the Looking Glass Theatre at the midpoint of the sequence of workshops had the effect of relating the workshop activities to the theatre experience. The theatre performance was meant to be perceived by teachers and students as a more highly developed and skillful application of what they themselves had experienced in the workshops.

The educational drama program was limited to elementary schools, and applications for participation were processed on a first come-first served basis. So as to promote mutual reinforcement of learning, two teachers from each school were invited to take part. The teachers were told that the sequence of workshop experiences was expected to motivate the use of improvisational techniques, games, and exercises in appropriate classroom activities with their own students and with others in the school.

Student workshops were conducted in the classrooms of both teachers in each school and the student groups joined together for the Looking Glass Theatre performances. To achieve maximum continuity, !Improvise! specialists were assigned specific schools. Each workshop director thus had an opportunity to get to know the teachers and students over a period of several weeks.

Graduate credit was arranged through Rhode Island College, and academic requirements were monitored by Dr. Picozzi for those teachers who requested credit. The teachers themselves paid tuition costs whereas the school paid the shared-cost fee of $250 for the program. The program ran from March 4, 1971, to June 10, 1971.

Arts in Education Program
The JDR 3rd Fund, Inc.*

Jack Morrison and Judie Contrucci

Pilot Projects

The Arts in Education Program placed emphasis initially on the support of several pilot projects which are designed to determine whether it is possible to make the arts an integral part of the general education of every child in a school system. The major objective of the projects therefore is concerned with the interests and capabilities of all the children in the school population and the continuing usefulness of the arts in the life of each individual.

These projects complement the existing art and music programs and broaden the scope of the arts to include dance, theater, film, photography, literature and environmental design. They are designed to place the arts within the larger context of knowledge and understanding with which the schools are concerned rather than continuing the practice which is so widespread of teaching the arts as specialized subjects which attract students with particular talents.

Comprehensive projects involving all of the children in a school, or in entire school systems, had not been tried before these pilot projects began. The objective of making the arts central to education has been a popular one for many years, but efforts to realize this goal have been piecemeal and have not taken root problems into account. The pilot projects were initiated because it was felt that they would provide a means for identifying these problems and some approaches to solving them.

At this stage the projects have demonstrated that the arts can be made central to the education of all children, along with the traditional "basic" subjects such as reading, mathematics, and science. Further, the procedures developed illustrate several approaches that can be used to accomplish this

---

*Based on the 1971 Annual Report of the JDR 3rd Fund, Inc.

goal. While it is too soon to draw final conclusions, a good deal of information is growing out of the pilot projects which may be of value to other schools that wish to initiate similar plans.

University City Pilot Project

In the School District of University City (a suburb of St. Louis) the majority of some eight thousand students from kindergarten through the twelfth grade are involved in the arts as part of their general education. This has been accomplished not only through the pilot project supported by the JDR 3rd Fund, but by the instruction in art and music which was under way when the project began, and through events and activities provided by arts organizations such as the St. Louis Symphony, the City Art Museum of St. Louis, the Loretto Hilton Theater at Webster College, and the Theater Alliance of University City. An additional new resource has been provided to the School District through curriculum development work carried on by the Aesthetic Education Program at CEMREL, Inc., in St. Louis. A series of learning materials produced by CEMREL for kindergarten through the third grade are now in use in the University City schools.

The question of the role of the arts in the total curriculum of a school is a major problem which must be solved if the arts are to become integral to education. Since there are limitations of time in a school day or week, it is not practical (even if desirable) to introduce new and separate courses for kindergarten through twelfth grades in each of the arts. It is practical and quite possible, however, to include the arts in learning about a particular period or culture; and learning to see and hear with insight and understanding is as appropriate to natural science as to music or the visual arts.

The project has developed a number of interdisciplinary units which vary in length and complexity. Some are single units for use at certain grade levels, for example a tenth grade unit which examines commercial advertising and the ways the arts are used to influence consumer attitudes. This is part of the English program and provides another dimension to the study of how man communicates.

In two major areas--theater arts and environmental studies--units have been created that span a number of grade levels and consist of two or more sub-units of instruction to be taught in sequence. In theater arts a comprehensive curriculum for kindergarten through twelfth grade has been produced which is part of the language arts program. The understanding of live performances is emphasized. For example, a local theater group demonstrates how they improvise a production through interplay with the audience. The students learn how they, as members of this audience, influence the actors in their roles, as well as the quality of the performance and the direction it takes.

The social studies program, from kindergarten through ninth grade, includes the study of the natural and man-made environment. For very young children the emphasis is on observation, recognition, and listening--skills which are as important to general education as to the arts. In nature study in the third grade, where the natural science outdoor laboratory often is the setting, photographs and drawings record reactions to texture, color, and form in nature. Tape recorders capture the sounds of nature and are the basis for the study of musical compositions based on similar sounds. At the end of the unit, students make a large "nature scroll." In the middle grades the historical and cultural aspects of the environment are explored in a unit called Saint Louis, the River, and the Arts. By the ninth grade the emphasis is on the study of city planning and urban design to encourage critical awareness and the ability to make choices about the present-day environment.

During the past year all of the learning opportunities in the arts have been combined into the Comprehensive Arts Program. The range of instruction provided is very broad, including the visual arts, music, dance, theater, literature, photography and film study, city planning, and environmental design. Most importantly, perhaps, the status of the Comprehensive Arts Program is equal to that of programs in other subjects such as history, science, and English in meeting the educational goals of the school system.

40 JDR 3rd Fund

Public School 51 Pilot Project

This project is carried on by the Bank Street College of Education in Public School 51, an inner-city elementary school in New York City. The focus of the project is on a second major problem which must be solved if the arts are to become central to the education of all children. The project has concentrated upon the kinds of assistance, resources, and training needed by teachers and administrators if teaching and learning in the arts are to become part of their responsibilities.

Most teacher training has tended to concentrate on the use of materials and methods of artists and performers. Introductions to these activities can be invaluable in understanding the nature of the arts. However, if training does not include more than this first step, the results can be disappointing; since the teachers will use the "lessons" they have had to teach their classes, but will not understand how to apply what they have learned in creating new emphases and extensions of the school program.

In working with the teachers in P.S. 51, a variety of approaches have been used: weekly luncheon workshops and afternoon seminars for teachers; demonstrations and consultations by the staff and outside resource personnel; and visits by teachers to other schools, to arts organizations, and to other projects in the New York area. As teachers began to use what they learned in their classrooms, the project staff and school specialists assisted as consultants to provide encouragement, support, and assistance in identifying goals and procedures. Changes can be seen in day-to-day activities which illustrate ways in which the arts added meaning and depth of understanding to the total program:

> ...A fifth-grade teacher developed a story-reading service based on dramatic presentations of literature by older children for younger ones. This teacher also incorporated art objects, slides, music, and the making of food and clothes into a unit on Colonial America. Instead of having a descriptive or reporting function, the arts contributed to feeling and expression.

> ...In science the teaching approach was changed so that students could be organized as a film crew to shoot an animated film based on stories they had written. Of special interest was a film on space travel.
>
> Children learned the mechanics of animation, filming, and projection. Equally important, they related their understandings of rockets, interplanetary travel, and other concepts in science to the drawings and paintings they made.
>
> ...The art specialist helped teachers introduce the visual arts into their classrooms and the results included several exhibitions, puppet plays, and prints. In general, the role of the art specialist became more closely integrated into the instructional pattern of the school.

Work by the project staff in P.S. 51 has clarified a number of considerations which are necessary for the successful development of an arts education program in an inner-city elementary school: recognizing the range of staff and consultant responsibilities; gaining necessary support for program developments; identifying leadership personnel from within and outside the school; carrying on the necessary in-service training of teachers; and developing means for program planning and evaluation. A key outcome is the identification of the kinds of assistance needed by classroom teachers to gain a sense of confidence and capability in working with the arts, and in using a variety of arts resources effectively. Overall, the project's major contribution can be found in the specific information it provides regarding the role of classroom teachers, specialist teachers in the arts, and administrators in establishing a program in the arts in general education in an elementary school.

Mineola Pilot Project

A third major problem encountered in incorporating the arts into the

schools is concerned with the role of artists and arts organizations such as symphony orchestras, dance and theater groups, and museums in relation to the educational goals of the schools. Logically it would seem that original works of art and live performances are indispensable to an understanding of the arts. In actual practice these authentic resources are considered desirable but hardly essential, and provision for them is not included in most school budgets.

The pilot project in Mineola, New York, was based on a fine arts program which had been under way for several years before the pilot project began. Financed with school funds, it had grown from 3 events the first year (ballet, chamber music and opera) and an attendance of 2,700 pupils to 34 activities with an attendance of 22,938 pupils and adults the third year. The district was making considerable progress towards its goal of involving students, kindergarten through senior high, in a wide array of activities. What was needed, however, was a way to transform the arts events from isolated experiences to a series of arts activities that had a truly functional relationship with the total curriculum. Through the pilot project it was expected that procedures could be developed to make the arts integral to each child's education, and that the arts could become not only relevant but essential to the total educational program, fully compatible with other areas of study.

During the first year of the project, major emphasis was placed on an evaluation by the project staff and teachers, students, and administrators of the kinds of activities that were useful to classroom teachers: what types of events appealed to students and why; how scheduling and logistics could be improved; and, overall, what events supported and enhanced the total educational program.

From the considerable data which resulted, generalizations were drawn to guide the project's next steps. Work toward curriculum change centered in four major areas: revision and modification of the arts events program; teacher preparation and training for curriculum development and classroom

use of new materials; the development of prototype units; and evaluation strategies.

In the development of teaching approaches for classroom use, activities are identified which help children understand performances they will attend. An example is a unit on making puppets and producing puppet plays in connection with a puppet show by professionals. An extensive unit is under development at the junior high school level entitled Worlds of Art. This is designed to help students learn to look and see, listen and hear. Emphasis is on the poetic and imaginative possibilities in everyday experience: color and movement in nature and man-made forms, textures of fabrics, building materials, trees, and stones, or the sounds of machines, voices, and nature. Students and teachers engage in discovering the unusual aspects of the commonplace--things that often escape attention in the rush of everyday experience.

Classroom activities involve students in a variety of experiences with emphasis on the related aspects of seeing, feeling, listening, and moving, and the arts events provide the opportunity for students to learn multiple ways of responding to aesthetic experiences.

During the first year of the project, attendance by students and adults was 44,000 in 128 separate activities and 37 major professional performances. In addition to a wide range of performing arts programs and two film series, visiting artists are associated with the project in various ways which range from participation in teacher training to working with students. The Orchestra da Camera, a professional orchestra, is in residence in the school district. This provides an important resource for the music program, and also enables all students and the community to become acquainted with the various day-to-day activities of an orchestra as well as hearing concerts which it performs.

The Aesthetic Education Program CEMREL, Inc.

Stanley S. Madeja and Sharon Bocklage

The Aesthetic Education Program of CEMREL, Inc.* is designing packaged materials for youngsters, grades K through 3, that build upon the enthusiasm and joy in discovery that is a hallmark of childhood, focusing that enthusiasm on experiencing the beauty, the order, and the form to be found in the arts and in the environment. The program is based on two premises: that knowledge of beauty, of order, and of form is precious to the full development of aesthetic sensibility and the human spirit, and that this total awareness can and should be cultivated in children in the schools, in order that the arts may help to shape the imagination, the tastes, and values of a society. The arts provide insight into the aesthetic sensitivities and capabilities of our society, establish continuity between the past and the present, and, through bringing about an awareness of environmental values, provide impetus for improvement. But most importantly, the arts help individuals develop and shape their perceptions, their patterns of thinking, their creativity, and their judgments.

Program Goals

The arts are a richly figured, intricate network of ideas and attitudes, which must be approached with clearly defined skills if they are to yield their treasures of joy, excitement, and a sense of creative participation.

---

*CEMREL, Inc. (formerly known as The Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, Inc.) is a not-for-profit corporation, receiving funds, in part, from the U. S. Office of Education under contract OEC 3-7-062875-3056.

A child exposed to the kind of creative education the Aesthetic Education Program is developing will build skills in perceiving, analyzing, and reacting to beauty, order, and form. He will be able to make quality judgments on aesthetic criteria, weighing and valuing theatrical performances, music, dance events, works of visual art, films, and literary efforts. And throughout his involvement with the program's materials, he will be encouraged to look, to listen, to feel, to enjoy.

The groups of instructional packages are planned to complement rather than replace current instruction in the arts and in general education, and can be effectively handled by the classroom teacher and the art specialist alike. To this end, the aesthetic qualities of all the arts, rather than discrete instruction in one or several arts areas, are the focus of the materials. Arts areas are juxtaposed in some of the packages, pointing up differences as well as similarities. Packages entitled Tension, and Relating Sound and Movement are examples of such combinations. A range of art forms, styles, and periods is presented in other packages--the musical selections in Meter range from Beethoven to the Fifth Dimension. But content is not limited to the arts--aesthetic aspects of the environment, technology, and nature are presented, discussed, and evaluated in packages such as Texture: Visual/Tactile, and Aural Texture. And, of special importance, a range of points of view about aesthetic qualities in objects and events, about the creative process itself, and about critical responses are given honest exploration in packages such as The Composer, The Choreographer, Creating Characterization, and Constructing Dramatic Plot.

Instructional Units

To make Aesthetic Education Program materials philosophically and pedagogically sound and usable by the greatest number of students and by regular classroom teachers with a minimum of training, a modular system of packaged units of instruction has been developed. The content basis for the packages was developed from Guidelines: Curriculum Development for Aesthetic

Education,* the summative publication of Phase 1 of the program. In this document, contributing scholars organized content around "centers of attention," a compilation of focal points for student activities that are representative of aesthetic phenomena within the areas of literature, theatre, film, visual arts, dance, and music, and the relationships among these phenomena.

Although the packages are not sequenced, their grouping according to content provides curriculum developers with resource material from which to build a course of study in aesthetic education for a school. The arrangement of packages into sequences of learning experiences is thus left to those who know the school's policies and population best. In addition, there is overlapping between the groups, which will provide the necessary linkages for eventual sequencing of packages into extended segments of instruction by grade level or multiple levels. (While we have indicated grade levels for the materials, these represent levels at which the packages have been tested, not necessarily the level at which they must be used.) Four groups, each centering attention on an elementary aspect of aesthetic qualities or phenomena, have emerged for the primary levels.

The first group of packages, called Aesthetics in the Physical World, provides for investigating the aesthetic qualities of time, space, motion, sound, and light. These elements transcend the arts disciplines and thus provide a means for unifying studies of the arts into aesthetic education. Exemplars from all the arts disciplines form the content, and a basic premise in each of the packages is that all phenomena may have aesthetic qualities, whether they be man-made or natural.

The second group, Aesthetics and Arts Elements, encompasses concepts that relate specifically to the elements applied in the arts and the environment. Packages such as Aural Texture, Tension,

---

*Guidelines: Curriculum Development for Aesthetic Education, Manuel Barkan, Laura Chapman, Evan J. Kern (St. Louis: CEMREL, Inc., 1970) page 87.

Meter, and Texture: Visual/Tactile appear in this group. The emphasis is on recognition of the elements within an arts discipline and its relationship to the structure of the whole work the aesthetic phenomenon. Although the student is engaged in some activities in which he transforms elements into an art form the emphasis is more on perceiving and describing the structure of the creative process in order to begin development of the critical and descriptive skill necessary to making aesthetic judgments.

The third group of packages, Aesthetics and the Creative Process, presents the process of transforming the elements into whole works of art. The student is attending to methods by which he creates his own structure, and in the process creates works of art. Thus, he enters into the process of making aesthetic judgments. Inherent in this process is the formulation of a basis for aesthetic judgments by the students. This group includes Dramatic Plot, Word Pictures, Sound and Movement, and Characterization.

The fourth group, Aesthetics and the Artist, emphasizes how professionals in the arts organize arts elements into the whole work and includes The Composer, and The Choreographer. The continuity in this series is based on the role similarities that all artists share within the creative process: each originates an idea and organizes elements into an end product that communicates. Several patterns begin to emerge in packages in this group. Although artists may work in different disciplines, utilizing different materials and methodologies, the structures of their works and the process of transformation exhibit similarities. It is this fourth group that represents an important cross pollination both between the arts and between the groups themselves.

The Development Process

Large scale, systematic production of instructional packages is a complex process involving many people. Curriculum team members prepare the content for instruction; staff associates advise on its direction and quality; graphics and shop personnel design and construct films, games, and models; and editors clarify the language and check reading levels of instructional

packages. Evaluation experts aid the team members in specific ways as the packages are being developed and are responsible for the formal testing of the materials.

Central to all these endeavors is the work of the curriculum development team members; translating content into instructional materials is the essence of the whole development process. Where possible, the development teams base their work on the best current research available. In actuality, however, the paucity of useful research means that the development teams must depend on the best set of resources available--children and teachers in the classrooms.

Evaluation

First Steps

All major decisions regarding the nature and content of the individual instructional packages, as well as of the program as a whole, are made on the bases of four evaluation stages. The first stage, "messing around," is a time during which the most valuable evaluators of the materials and their effectiveness are children. Teaching children in small informal groups allows the developer to begin the process of specification of materials and to begin honing ideas. This process continues in meetings with the other artist-writers, and ideas and materials are further revised after consultation with staff associates. The focus, however, continues to be on the children. Whether they enjoy using the package is always a criterion of success, and activities that bore them are among those that are rethought, redesigned, or thrown out. After several such messing around periods, when appropriate ideas, activities, procedures, and materials have been developed and organized, a complete instructional package comes into being and awaits a "hothouse trial."

Hothouse Trials

At this point it's hands-off for the artist-writer and hands-on for a cooperating classroom teacher and his students. An observer from CEMREL's evaluation staff attends every session during the hothouse trial, watching for and

noting successes as well as difficulties encountered regarding the use patterns and design of the physical materials, the teacher-learner instructions, and student behaviors as they relate to the objectives of the package. Prototype assessment devices integral to the package receive the same trial as the carrier activities themselves.

Pilot Tests

The third step, the pilot tests, are designed to find out whether the package is capable of standing alone in the hands of non-arts teachers; whether the prescribed instructional procedures lead to the designated outcomes with children of different ethnic groups, races, and socio-economic statuses, the degree to which these outcomes can be expected to generalize to similar student populations; whether the teachers and students actually enjoy using the package, and the degree to which the assessment devices accurately reflect student learning.

In two pilot tests, each involving five packages, the non-arts teachers have given valuable feedback about classroom management and format of materials, and have made suggestions about the structure of the learning activities. For example, the Creating Characterization package was pilot tested with puppets included in the materials. Teacher and student concerns about difficulties in manipulating the puppets led to redesigning the puppets as masks to fulfill the same instructional objective.

The media for assessment are as carefully planned and designed as the rest of the package materials, and include checklists with which students evaluate the work of their fellows, filmed assessment items, and slide reproductions of art works. In Creating Word Pictures, students demonstrate the learning that has taken place by taking a post-test that parallels the structure of one activity in the package, the "What is...?" Game. In Texture: Visual/Tactile, they match photographs of environmental textures to renderings of those textures in reproductions of works of art.

Extended Pilot Test

The fourth evaluation step, extended pilot test, is presently being carried out in schools in several states. The extended pilot testing is conducted in several different ways to serve different functions, but in each instance the materials are used by regular classroom teachers under the normal supervision and administration of the school.

In Pennsylvania, nine schools have been selected by the State Department of Education, and CEMREL will carry out a carefully planned summative evaluation procedure which will result in a report for each of the packages. In other locations the collection of evaluation data will be much less intensive and the major functions are to provide demonstration sites and diffusion plans as described in a later section of this program description.

Implementation of The Aesthetic Education Program

Educator Familiarization

Currently CEMREL conducts workshops for arts specialists, curriculum developers, curriculum coordinators, and school administrators who represent school systems that are participating in the extended pilot test of the packages. Each workshop consists of 10 hours of instruction time and includes an introduction to the program and its aims and specific training in use of the packages. CEMREL also arranges for follow-up conferences with users and for supervision during use, where appropriate.

Teacher Education

A second major implementation concern is teacher education, not only in-service workshops for the elementary generalist-teacher, but also pre-service courses in aesthetic education. Teacher education institutions are central, of course, to the preparation of teachers for aesthetic education. CEMREL, therefore, has cooperated, and will continue to cooperate with colleges and universities to upgrade pre-service programs for classroom teacher preparation, as well as the preparation of arts specialists in aesthetic education.

52 CEMREL

In its role as catalyst and information clearinghouse, CEMREL has sponsored three teacher education conferences, in which representatives of 30 higher education institutions participated. The purpose of the conferences was to bring together people interested in establishing pre-service methods courses in aesthetic education. Participating institutions include: Clark College, Columbia University, Florida State University, George Peabody College for Teachers, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Lehigh University, Marillac College, Middle Tennessee State University, New York University, North Texas State University, Northeast Missouri State College, Northern Illinois University, Ohio University, Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State University, St. Cloud State College, St. Louis University, San Fernando Valley State College, San Francisco State University, University of California at Los Angeles, University of Illinois, University of Iowa, University of Massachusetts, University of South Florida, University of Utah, University of Tennessee at Martin, University of Wisconsin, Webster College, Western Kentucky University, and the Pennsylvania State Department of Education.

CEMREL plans to continue its catalytic role in three ways:

1. CEMREL will cooperate with colleges and universities in the establishment of 10 to 12 regional centers, each of which will set up a materials resource and demonstration center containing CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program packages and materials that reflect the growing importance of aesthetic education. The centers will be in those institutions that also have pre-service programs for teachers of aesthetic education.

2. CEMREL will disseminate information on new curricula, research, and other programs in aesthetic education.

3. CEMREL will coordinate communications among the centers, with meetings, visits, newsletters, graduate student exchanges, and workshops for information sharing.

The scholars who make up the Aesthetic Education Program's National Advisory Committee and those who serve as Staff Associates exert a strong influence on teacher education within their own institutions and organizations. Several of these people have directly involved their institutions in the

teacher education plans described above, and others, whose affiliations include the University of California at Santa Cruz, the University of Southern California, Wayne State University, The Minneapolis School System, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, Columbia University, University of California at Los Angeles, The National Council of Teachers of English, The University of Pittsburgh, Princeton University, and Bradeis University, support and guide the philosophical base of the program in their teaching and writing.

Diffusion

CEMREL's model for diffusion includes the following: professional information exchange; an information service to the general public, to colleges and universities, to state departments of education, and to schools; and a variety of cooperative relationships with other educational laboratories, state departments of education, school districts, universities, and such groups as the JDR 3rd Fund school network.

In order to keep the field current on what is happening with the Aesthetic Education Program, the program has been represented at professional meetings: at a two-day conference institute on aesthetic education at the National Art Education Association Biennial Conference in April 1971; and through presentations at the Binational Dance Conference, held in Montreal in June 1971. The Music Educators National Conference and CEMREL jointly published Toward an Aesthetic Education, a book derived from papers presented during the 1970 MENC National Biennial Convention.

Over 15,000 educators, both in this country and abroad, have expressed interest in the Aesthetic Education Program and in the other work of the laboratory. Periodic newsletters are sent to these people informing them of new developments in the program.

The Aesthetic Education Program is arranging for extended pilot use of materials with several states and school districts. The general plan is for the cooperating state or local education agency to locate certain schools to act as test sites. During extended testing the schools act as demonstration sites. The schools participate in a cost-sharing program which includes the cost of the learning packages, CEMREL's orientations for

specialists and coordinators, and consultative services. The state or local education agency will provide information services about this program to schools throughout the state or school district. As of June 1972, arrangements in various stages of completion involved over 27 states and 89 different school districts and educational institutions.

Evaluation for Aesthetic Education: A Discussion

with: Asahel D. Woodruff,
Donald Jack Davis,
David Addington, and
George Gunkle, Moderator

Gunkle: In the early part of our session I think we are going to try to set forth a couple of principles, and here David and I are really guided considerably by Asahel and Jack who have been working for a long time in this area with CEMREL. I think the outcome of the early portion will be a fairly clear idea of a piece of work that we might be able to do. You will have an opportunity to help shape what that work will be, and in a later part of the session we will go about doing it. Could we begin with Asahel?

Woodruff: We can start by recognizing that we are operating around a concept of evaluation which I think we all generally see as the process of finding out what is going on and, particularly in educational circles, finding out whether students are learning. About the only kinds of outcomes that we can in any sense at all evaluate, no matter how you define that term, are things that you can see. Now I don't want to imply when I say this that you have to rule out thinking, or people's decisions or people's values, because there are ways of making them visible. But you do have to get at something you can see in some form or another, and usually what we find when we are evaluating is some form of behavior. That is literally true whether you are talking about plain, old, academic form of education or some of the more modern concepts of behavioral objectives. Because the things we evaluate in the old education model are things like naming, describing things,

reiterating information about things, paying attention in class, being a good social conformist, participating in discussions, and so on. These are behavior decisions--just as literally as any of the modern concepts of behavioral objectives. So we can assume that we evaluate on the basis of behavior. From that point, one of the first questions is, What behavior are we interested in assessing? And personally I have lost interest in those academic games--where the record of transfer is pretty dismal--things that we learn in an old academic mold practically have nothing to do with the way we behave when we get out of school. Let us begin by turning to the more literal kinds of acts in which we are interested. In the case of theatre we are concerned with the things you do when you act, the things you do when you write, the things you do when you lay out a stage, the things you do when you decide on costumes and make costumes, the things you do when you direct. You might just as well go right to them and start looking at them instead of trying to get some intermediate indicator of those behaviors. That is all that is being said by the modern behaviorial technician. In other words, to use a perfectly mundane, old phrase, you might just as well go right to the "horse's mouth" and find out what this thing is all about and work with the real thing.

Audience: Are you trying to measure the art student who is observing in another art form or are you trying to measure the technique of the art student as he is practicing his art?

Woodruff: We would probably be interested in both and in theatre I assume that you are interested in viewers--people who constitute audiences because that is a form of behavior within the realm of theatre too. Watching, understanding, responding.

Audience: Measuring audience response is not measuring the artistic value of the practitioner?

Woodruff: No, you are not measuring the value of the practitioner you are measuring audiences.

Addington: This very problem you brought up, setting the objectives, depends upon what group of people you are focusing on. Are we going to be talking about educating practitioners or are we going to be talking about educating audience members or are we talking about educating critics?

Davis: It seems to me that in the broader context of aesthetic education we cannot afford to overlook the theatre as it fits into the general education of students as opposed to specialized education. I think that if we do we are missing a great portion of the potential student population.

Audience: How do you describe evaluation? For whom are you evaluating?

Woodruff: Let's say that as an instructor you want to find out what is happening to your students, so you evaluate to find out for your own information. We can narrow it to anybody who is interested in what is happening to someone else.

Addington: In other words, in order to set an objective for a student, it is necessary at the same time to say how you are going to evaluate that objective when you arrive there.

Audience: No, not quite. I associate evaluation with measuring experience with the intention of having some kind of value for someone placed on what is measured.

Woodruff: If you are raising the question of what we are going to do with the evaluation after we get it, I think we probably ought to set that aside. First of all let's investigate how to find out what is happening and then talk about what to do with what is found.

Woodruff: When you decide on some outcome that you would like to produce and you have stated it clearly enough so you know what it is, you have already devised your evaluation instrument. That is what that statement is. So really we are talking about just simply being clear about what you are trying to produce. If you are clear, then when the student does whatever he is supposed to be able to do when you get through with your instructions, you look at his results and see if he actually did it, and that is the evaluation. It is as simple as that as far as I am concerned--simply detecting whether the thing you expected to bring about has actually come about as a result of your work with it. Now one of the main reasons for looking at the student's result is--if you didn't bring about what you wanted--try again--go back and make another attack at it and see if you can produce it by some other device, assuming it is worthwhile to try and reach it in the first place.

Audience: Assuming your outcome will always be the same?

Woodruff: Just assuming that you have named an outcome that you attempt to try to produce. If the student can't produce the outcome then you find out what happened--why didn't he come up with it--then go back and repair the method. Well I think one of the most touchy questions in this whole field is How do we describe what we want to happen? Now that problem exists in all the fine arts, I think, to a very marked extent. You may feel that if we try to become precise about what is happening in theatre behavior we may destroy the theatre. I know that feeling is a very common one. If that is the case then we have to work around that a little bit. We need to discover how it is possible for us to learn to see much more clearly than we have ever done before what it is we are doing and that by doing this we are not destroying what we are examining. In fact we are making it possible for us to comprehend it much more fully and be much more creative in doing it.

That is one problem we need to keep in mind. I think that tips you off to a corollary fact--that when you start to talk about evaluation--like it or not--you are committing yourself to precision. This is so because there is no evaluation without some degree of precision, and the more useful the evaluation becomes the more precise it has to be. Now that means you have to have a bunch of little nasty persons who set objectives come into the glorious field of art and start finding out what its component parts are--what they are like, how they go together, what the possibilities of variability are. Well, those are some of the problems we face when we start to dig into the question, Can we name the behaviors that constitute the field of theatre?

Audience: Behaviors of the audience or the practitioners?

Woodruff: Well, both.

Audience: Well, when you analyze the behavior of the audience are you not analyzing the practitioner's art?

Woodruff: We would be looking at their response to the theatre.

Audience: But may it not give you any real clue to whether they understand what they are seeing?

Davis: If that is one of the behaviors we want to examine, then we have to determine whether they do indeed understand.

Woodruff: Maybe implied in your question is whether we would be using the audience as a way of assessing the player--the answer to that would be no as far as I am concerned. I would be studying the audience behavior in order to understand the

audience. I would like to see general education, for example, have some kind of program that would help a person become a better playviewer; by that I mean enjoy a play more, get more from it, understand more of what he sees.

Audience: Sir, would you say that to enjoy is a behavior, to wonder is a behavior, to exhalt is a behavior?

Woodruff: Practically speaking yes--now you have to make some technical differentiations between an act and a characteristic or mood--something of that sort that goes along with the act. But listening, perceiving, interpreting, explaining to yourself or to anyone else--these are specific behaviors.

In one of our projects, where we are trying to get at the general aesthetic aspect of all the fine arts, we came up with about four basic behaviors that are consuming behaviors and not producing behaviors. I don't know whether I can remember them all right now. One of them consuming, another is identifying--some stimlus is coming at you and you are recognizing something in it that enables you to identify with it; so, there is an act of identification going on. The third is emphasizing and the fourth is contemplating what has taken place during the first three. Now lying behind these are these covert things you are talking about--all of these kinds of responses are mediated by conceptional analytic structure.

Audience: You said earlier that you wouldn't study the audience to assess performance. Do you really mean that?

Audience: If, let's say, the performer establishes as his own criteria a certain effect on the audience, wouldn't that, then, force you to look at the audience?

Woodruff: Well, I think in a way it wouldn't--maybe I would want to differentiate here between an entertainer and an actor.

Addington: What about a director? It seems to me very definitely that as a director I set goals for myself in terms of what I expect or don't expect from the audience. For example, the most obvious--a laugh line that is timed a particular way, and I have worked laboriously with the actor to get the exact timing I want. The proof of the pudding in this case, at least for me the director, is the affect on the audience, laughter.

Woodruff: The audience's behavior in that instance is an indicator of acceptance, but it is not a descriptor of the thing that the actor did. You still have to look to the actor to find that out.

Addington: I think also when you get the director in here you are getting another dimension. It would be true that as a director I would evaluate the actor's effectiveness perhaps on the basis of whether or not he did what I wanted him to do. I would evaluate my own effectiveness in terms of what affect it had on the audience. In other words if the actor does what I wanted him to do, and I perceive that and the audience doesn't laugh, then I can blame myself. If the actor does something different than what I wanted him to do and I still get the response I wanted, then again I question my own effectiveness as a director.

Audience: I don't want to get bogged down in semantics and perhaps I am just confused or misinformed, but it seems to me that aesthetics has something to do with feelings. If this is so, then when we talk about aesthetic education and the evaluation thereof, I get a little bothered if I have to think in terms of concrete or overt (you were saying observable) behaviorial patterns on the part of those being educated. I was wondering just exactly how we cut through to the quality of the feelings or if we can to evaluate the end product.

Woodruff: Well, that is an awfully interesting question--the question of, what are we talking about aesthetics or theatre? and you are talking about aesthetics--aren't you?

Audience: I am talking about aesthetic education and I think it has a place in the theatre.

Audience: Can't what theatre does be translated into a teaching and learning process we can call aesthetic education?

Gunkle: We can identify in the theatre several different kinds of things that we teach, general kinds of things that we do very well, that may or may not have anything to do with certain notions of an aesthetic dimension. We teach, I think, extremely well and make extremely good judgments in very technical things in the theatre dealing with high degrees of specialized knowledge. These are things such as running lighting boards, doing the niceties of scene painting, etc. We do this pretty well and there is a high degree of convergence we expect out of students in handling these things, if only for their own safety and, of course, other reasons. We do that kind of thing pretty well. That's one kind of thing we do. Another kind of thing I think we do pretty well is both convergent and divergent in our own kind of rules system about conventions. I think we are constantly shaping people either towards the doing things by the "rules" that lie implicit within many of us or deviating from them wildly, sometimes imaginatively building their own kinds of games. But these are all in a sense very specialized, technical-training kinds of things. Now that isn't quite the same thing as fostering, in some sense or another, an aesthetic dimension that might have certain properties in common with other arts or other kinds of activities. If that happens it often happens sort of by chance in some of our usual curricula. It may be by chance that someone, for example, becomes highly discriminating about colors or shapes or forms or this or that; and yet, that may be very useful for him in engaging in some specialized function in the theatre.

Gunkle: An example that comes to my mind is timing--a sensitivity to things that happen in motion--very crucial to almost everybody in the theatre and a lot of other people as well. We may be working on some particular motion with an actor very directly--some piece of technical skill that he must learn--some kind of relationship between motion and line reading and activity--you know, something very technical, but the fundamental structure migh have something more to do with sensitivity to things which he may never be attacking directly.

Woodruff: Take the actor who is one of the central figures in a movie--what sorts of things do actors do? Now, I think what you finally have to do is to sit down with a great deal of patience and no hurry at all and an absolutely uninhibited approach and just start brainstorming, digging back through your experiences as actors or with actors. Write down the kinds of things that come up and then begin to sort them out and finally you begin to find some categories--you musn't try to force any kind of order on what you have. Just simply live with it until you are describing what actors do--not what the book says they do but what actors actually do. Then you begin to find that you can handle on what constitutes behaviors of that particular part. Little by little, I think you find that you can make fine discriminations among those things that probably you thought at first you could not discriminate.

Gunkle: I think that maybe to attack something fairly concrete for awhile is the job of work now and to try to do a little behaviorizing together. We might then be able to go back and pull out of that something that might be a little bit different--that might be something that gets at some of our notions of what we think is aesthetic.

Davis: We are at the point to say that I think we are prone in the arts to take sort of a fatalistic approach to evaluation, in

that we don't want to measure anything unless we can measure the ultimate. I think we should take just the opposite approach--we will measure whatever we can and agree that there are probably a lot of other things going on that we may never be able to assess, but we start where we can and we go as far as we can. I think this is what every other area of the curriculum does.

Woodruff: Let me suggest a little switch here away from evaluation. What we find ourselves working on in behaviorially analyzed curriculum is what I would call an action and its consequence. When a particular act is performed, what is the consequence that follows? What kind of effect does it have? What does it bring about in you or somebody else? Now our behavior is pretty well governed by our conceptional patterns that consist of the way we visualize acts and their consequences. It isn't a question of how ethical or how noble acts are, but what actually comes about when I do this or this or this in this way or in this way; so, it is effect we are talking about. Now, if an individual can analyze all the kinds of components of acts which put together constitute acting, he can begin to find out good educational material because the individual can then manipulate his behavior to produce the kinds of effects he wants to produce.

Audience: Dr. Woodruff, for at least three years now you have been advising CEMREL in constructing packages in art, music, drama, etc. Could you tell us what kind of advice you gave CEMREL, what behaviors you identified, and where you are in terms of evaluation?

Woodruff: Let me ask Jack to respond to that. I have been in and out but Jack has been right there involved in the production. Could you describe for a little while some of the kinds of behavior you have identified and how you are turning this into educational equipment?

Davis: Assessment in the arts poses many unique problems due to the special nature of cognition related to or involving the arts, the complexities which arrive from the tradition of expressiveness in the arts, the range of valid and valued responses, as well as the lack of absolute criteria--to mention only a few. Due to the uniqueness of these problems, as well as to the lack of a cognitively secure body of knowledge in arts evaluation, there is a need for the development of a position which will guide the development of assessment items for the learning packages.

Considerable effort has been expended in developing an evaluation model for the development of assessment items for the learning packages. (See Figure on page 67). The expected outcomes of each package are concerned with changes in human behavior which are either directly observable overt behaviors or covert responses. In the former situation, the expected outcomes would be the behavior itself. However, if the expected outcomes are covert responses, then overt expressions must be sought for evaluation purposes. In that case, the overt expression would only be an indication that the overt response is going on.

If the expected outcomes are clearly overt behaviors, they may be of two major types: (1) immediately observable overt behaviors such as acquisition of skills; or (2) long range, observable overt behaviors such as continuing skill improvement. The primary focus of the Aesthetic Education Program at this point is with the former--immediately observable overt behavior. The evaluation problem, therefore, becomes one of establishing meaningful criteria and developing useful methodology.

On the other hand, many of the expected outcomes will be internal or covert responses such as appreciation, understanding,

and the like. In respect to such matters, there is frequently little agreement among substantive specialists as to an absolute overt expression of the internal response. Thus, the question of evaluation becomes a perplexing one. To guide the evaluation staff in using its resources wisely in dealing with such problems, it is projected that the probability of determining overt expressions of covert responses ranges from high to low. The probability of a specific overt expression being indicative of a given covert response must be determined and stated by the substantive specialists. For example, for a given, expected covert response such as understanding the concept of highness in sound, the substantive specialists would agree that there is a high probability that a particular observable behavior such as identifying the higher of two sound examples is indicative of the covert response. In so doing, the specialist is saying that the overt expression is a low inference one in that very little inference has to be drawn between the internal response and the external expression. In another situation, the substantive specialists would subjectively agree there is a low probability that a particular overt expression such as verbal admission is indicative of kinesthetic sensations from movement, a covert response. However, it may be the only identifiable expression at the moment. In this situation, the developer or the staff associate is saying that the overt expression is a high inference one, in that a great deal of inference must be made between the internal response and the overt expression. Regardless of the designated position on the continuum, the evaluation problem becomes one of determining criteria and methodology for the identified overt expression. There is some question as to how high the probability should be before evaluation resources should be expended for mining out the criteria and developing the methodology. However, this is left up to the developer or the staff associate to determine.

Model for the development of assessment items†

†Basic Program Plan, Aesthetic Education Program (St. Louis: CEMREL, Inc., 1972), page 84.

*For example, the seven response categories presented in the "Thesaurus," Guidelines: Curriculum Development for Aesthetic Education by Manual Barkan, Laura Chapman, and Evan Kern (St. Louis: CEMREL, Inc., 1970), (analyze, judge, perceive, produce/perform, react, talk, value).

I think if we started trying to actually identify behaviors in a work session, we would come up with some that are observable, overt, but the majority of behaviors we would identify would probably be in the covert or internal dimension. However, I think that is a necessary step because until we come to a fairly clear notion of what we are trying to get at, we can't even make a decision about whether we can identify observable indicators of those internal responses. I think Asahel, in some early writings, has made a good point that most of the things we deal with in education indeed are indicators of internal responses. As I said earlier, even for many of the cognitive things, thinking and understanding, we only look at indicators as expressed in verbalization of that internal process or written statements of that internal process. Which are, I think, indicators of what is going on inside the student. We have been trying to deal with identifying overt behaviors as they relate to theatre or to the larger field of aesthetic education, but before you can really begin to get over into the nitty gritty of setting criteria for more effective or less effective kinds of responses or more acceptable or less acceptable ones, before you can begin to deal with the whole issue of methodology in evaluation, I think we ought to focus some attention now upon identifying these behaviors.

Woodruff: That is something you eventually have to do--just have to start looking for that pile of behaviors and the only way I know of to find them, as I was commenting to the group here, is just to start talking about what you do as a theatre person taking one of the roles for example--talk it over, get it out on the table in a very free, open, brainstorming way--so eventually you have a whole pile of things. Then you begin to see if there are common characteristics among these things--you see what they turn out to be.

Let me try something that has been inked out in the field of music. It is not specifically what we are talking about here, but the model is directly pertinent in trying to diagram what a piece of behavior is, in this case a musical behavior. There are three components which you need to identify in every act: one is the actual action that the organism, the person himself, goes through; the second one is what substance he does it to or with. (This is in accord with Dewey's very sound notion that human behavior is a transaction between an individual and something in his environment, doing something with something.) That's what we want to note here--whatever that substance is. Then, third, there is an outcome of that act. Every event produces a consequence. Human behavior is no exception to that; so, we are looking at an act which is performed upon some substance bringing about some kind of a consequence. Now, our first question is not Do we like the consequence? or Is it a good or bad consequence? Our first question is simply What is the consequence? If on the stage you do a certain thing in a certain way with some particular content, there is some kind of a consequence. If you change the form here or the content there, the consequence changes also. What you need to find out first is the relationship between these three components. What sorts of things does an actor do?

I also think it might be helpful to separate things the actor does for the purpose of learning from things he does when he has learned. After he has learned he does something which is his performance. First of all I'd try to find out what are the acts or behaviors of his performance because these are the ends. Then talk about the kinds of things he does in order to find out what he is doing. How well he is operating is another kind of act that is a learning act but not a performing act.

What constitutes acting--not learning to act but acting?

Audience: Listening to another actor...watching another actor...moving around...talking...understanding of a basic human situation of the character...doing something that demonstrates his understanding...translating something to his audience...

Woodruff: So you are saying that he is doing encoding behavior and decoding behavior at the same time.

I am not sure that I go for those terms--because I am not sure I know what they mean, but he is seeing something--something that he is aware of which he is transmitting to his audience.

Audience: He determines audience cues...he has to sense his audience as well as the other actors... Some subcategories--for example he is listening to other actors for his cue but he is also listening to the audience--two subcategories of listening--likewise he is watching the other actors on stage, perhaps, not only remembering his lines he is remembering how last night's audience responded.

How do you know he is listening to the audience if he doesn't even realize that this is going on?

Woodruff: Doesn't make any difference. He is doing it just the same.

Gunkle: He is waiting until another actor finishes before he says his lines. Sometimes he doesn't wait--cuts them off because that is what he is supposed to do.

Audience: You are talking about responding.

Woodruff: That is right. Replication is one of the most important things. He reacts appropriately to his environment.

Audience: Listening, talking, using subcategories, projecting--aren't we kind of saying that there is a cognitive domain, motor domain, etc.

He has to be able to talk and move at the same time, portray physical characteristics of the character. Must have good body control.

Woodruff: He replicates a movement pattern with accuracy.

Audience: It seems to me that the things we have been talking about are all technical things, things that could be produced in almost anyone--we could do it on a cue basis, have idiot cards that say "go like that" or "Remember to say...". What the actor does, it seems to me, is predicated on the "as if"--whether he is speaking with a cockney accent, whether he is following the script, whether he is having to ad lib because another actor has lost his concentration--"as if" he were Lear or Willie Loman.

Woodruff: I think that I would like to consider and distinguish between what you might call the mechanical act itself, an act that anyone would do in that role, and the manner in which the actor does it. Now, since this is not an area in which I feel very much at home, let me just venture a couple of possibilities. Isn't it possible that two actors would go through the same act, one of them doing it in a way that expresses his own personality regardless of who the character is supposed to be. Another goes through it in such a way that he expresses the personality of someone else; those are two different ways of doing it and both of them can be effective. Now, if we can get at the acts for a little while, then come to maybe a secondary question: What are the various ways in which these acts can be performed and what are the consequences of doing them with this approach or that approach? We may then be able to start adding the other factors.

Audience: I think that one of the things is that we sell ourselves short all the time. For example people are always talking about a really fine honest portrayal. We all know the story about the daytime T.V. actor who said, "Once you learn how to fake honesty you have it made." But he is telling us something very, very important--that it is possible to learn how to fake honesty. There are a whole bunch of cues that people pick up as being honesty--for instance a false start on a line. Brando did it to death, look at his old films. He starts a line, then restarts, then restarts. It is an obvious technique now but not back then. If you start looking at very, very small behavior you can start saying, "Alright this is that category which people take to be honesty." That may be the height of cynicism, but I think it is true.

Audience: That cliche of giving no clues whatsoever in a very tense scene; I can just sit there and think about lunch or whatever. The audience fills in all the rest, all the horrors that are happening to me because they know the contents of the play. So it comes purely from context and nothing that I am doing whatsoever. All the conventions that you could sit down and describe very well in Pinter plays, all the horror that builds up--he knows exactly that if actors just wait an incredibly long time to answer that people are going to say there is something going on.

Woodruff: Okay, we really are fishing out a whole gambit of things. Some are behaviors--some of them very calculated behaviors that produce very calculated response behaviors.

Gunkle: The actor has to use emotion and speech together, just like in everyday life. He has to handle objects and talk at the same time; a number of things simultaneously. But he is reproducing a lot of these things and that makes it particularly difficult. He is reproducing them simultaneously but against a particular amount of time that he has to do it.

Audience: An actor has to be able to maintain a rhythm from one actor to another back and forth or destroy a rhythm at a particular time, break into a new rhythm. An actor duplicates set emotional responses, set in terms that they are dictated by the script or the director's understanding of the script. An actor duplicates set emotional responses to other characters or to the dramatic situation.

Woodruff: That is a pointed category.

Audience: Sometimes, also, we talk about things that should be heard or seen, and there are also times when the actor has to do some arbitrary business and some other things where he conceals what he is doing, like a magician. Sometimes he has to be able to do nothing, well.

Woodruff: Now let's take that problem, being able to do nothing, well. I don't think we have much trouble visualizing generally what you are talking about; and, when you can start to move up closer to it, you find that it consists of two or three or four different things. You can begin to identify these things if you just stay with it long enough.

Gunkle: Perhaps being able to avoid distracting when focus should be somewhere else might be one of the components.

Audience: Something has been bothering me for the last hour. The best examples I can give are all the ones involved in the preparation stuff that goes on. I can think of a million things that are involved in preparing for that final performance.

Gunkle: We tend to concentrate so much on preparation behaviors and much less, in a sense, of that target, finished product. Breaking it down.

74 A Discussion on Evaluation

Audience: If you really want to boggle your mind, start thinking of target behaviors for a director.

Davis: I think that the interesting thing is that if you can get target behaviors or the critical properties of an actor then it doesn't matter whether you are approaching it from a point of view of educating someone to become an actor or someone looking at that actor. You have defined what his critical properties are.

Audience: I think you really do know what that target behavior is (at least a really good director does) or you wouldn't know what to rehearse; you don't know what you are going to stress tonight if you haven't figured out what you are going toward and what's wrong with the scene.

Audience: Yes, but I know often that the kind of evaluation that goes on and the kind of discussion that goes on is devoid of any notion of target behaviors.

Woodruff: We talk about intuitive behavior; there are a number of other ways of referring to the separation between recognized and verbalized ideas and unrecognized and unverbalized ideas. There seems to be a kind of mythology developed that there is another realm of thought than the general conceptional structure of the person and this other realm is often referred to as intuition or something of that sort. Now, each one of us has vast conceptional structures, a very large part of which is subconscious or unverbalized, unrecognized by ourselves. Whether we recognize it or not has nothing to do with whether it operates or not, whether it controls our behavior. Our behavior is controlled by our total conceptional pattern very much of which is subliminal. Nevertheless, this total conceptional pattern operates just as logically and faithfully by means of past experience as if we know all about it. Perhaps even more so because sometimes when we become

conscious of our own thoughts, they begin to interfere with their logical operations and we rationalize and a lot of things of that sort. You people who are actors, you have concepts, all the things that we are fishing out now. Why are they so hard to get out? Simply because we have not gone through the process of verbalizing them before. That is what we are trying to do right now. When you go at this for a little while, you will discover that you have an immense array of these ideas. You dredge them up from the subliminal area and verbalize them once or twice--then they become manageable property. You not only use them when you act but you can say them to yourselves, and you can use them deliberately to understand and analyze acting and to help somebody else get hold of it. That's all this process is for awhile. It is the dredging up of these subliminal concepts. Intuition is nothing but thinking subconsciously.

So it is all there--it is not as if we are going to invent something that isn't operative in theatre--it is all there, what we are trying to do at this point.

Audience: We accept or reject these target behaviors by process of trial or error. Somebody said a good director knows what these target behaviors are.

Woodruff: Or the director may say, "That is what I want." And he still may not be able to tell you just why that is what he wants.

Audience: And may not always be able to say what it is until it happens.

Woodruff: Or you can do something as an actor, and somebody will ask you what you did. And you say, "Damn if I know. I did it but I don't know what I did." If he can help you reconstruct it or if you could go back and look at yourself doing it, you could get a hold on it. You could do something that you know about, that you are consciously aware of. It is that line between doing and knowing that keeps us from getting or being precise and, I think, much more creative than we are.

Audience: As you were saying this, I was wondering if perceiving these particular actions is part of the group of the behaviors we want to teach in aesthetic education. Perceiving the behaviors that the actor is doing on stage affects the audience's aesthetic sensibilities of the performance. Maybe then, perceiving is one of the general behaviors that we were starting to get at before.

Woodruff: What I am talking about here is illustrated in art criticism by David Ecker. One definition of art criticism is the rendering of a referentially adequate description. Now, look at those three words carefully, the rendering of a "referentially adequate description." That is not making a judgment about a piece of art; it is telling exactly what is there in that piece of art. Most of us don't see exactly what is there; but Ecker says that a good critic is trained to see exactly what is there and render a referentially adequate description. Now can we do that in the theatre? Can we look at the whole operation and render a referentially adequate description of what goes on in the theatre?

Gunkle: We have trouble rendering a referentially adequate description of what goes on in acting!

Audience: We are too busy saying whether we like it or don't like it, whether it is a good interpretation. It is like asking somebody to look at a picture and say, "Tell me only about the color or the line and don't tell me whether you like it. If you see in the upper left hand corner a blob of red paint, don't tell me it is the sun. Tell me it is a blob of red paint."

Gunkle: Yes, and the fact that you said, "I see," is extremely crucial. That is the referential kind of thing.

Woodruff: One of the things that this kind of critic will do is say the artist did this and this and this, and what he did produced this kind of effect on the viewer. So he is adding to it, not merely what is there, but what it does to people.

Gunkle: Can we say that the actor renders a referentially adequate description of the character which an audience can recognize and relate to?

Audience: The actor uses combinations of sound and silence to communicate effectively the given idea or emotions of a character in a given situation... An actor performs in specialized activities, e.g. sword fighting, with ease.....an actor wears a period costume to produce a particular effect..he talks directly to an audience...doesn't look at the audience....uses space appropriately...he controls the area about him...he does things economically so that one gets the sense that he is not using any more motion or sound than what is right at that moment to get that effect.... It seems to me that each time we try to get hold of the specific things he does we start to attach fuzzy adjectives. He uses space appropriately"--what does that mean? You make a value judgment when you say appropriately.

Woodruff: Appropriate means he produces a certain kind of effect so you start asking, What is it he does that produces the effect? You get rid of the term appropriate and begin again having specific structures or movements within that particular act.

Instead of saying, "He uses space," you would say specifically what he does with space.

Audience: I have to ask a question. Haven't you at CEMREL gotten out reams of these? Haven't there been discussions from students in the country who have done this?

Rosenblatt: We have identified some behaviors. In spite of that, for everything that I write, I go through this process. This is the absolute, agonizing process, identifying the critical properties of what I am getting at. What is really to be done? Is the student being evoked to do that kind of thing? I attempt to delineate very specific kinds of parameters, very specific kinds of criteria, and very specific kinds of elements to deal with in evaluation.

Davis: I think one thing that should be said is that CEMREL hasn't defined all of the arts fields to this degree. We have attempted to define the content of each package to this level, but the task for developing packages would go much faster if the respective fields had already been defined to a level of specificity.

Woodruff: I would be very much surprised if anywhere in the literature there is an adequate breakdown of the behaviors of theatre.

Rosenblatt: We can list general behaviors such as perceiving, recognizing, reacting, responding, producing, performing, and solving, but the most important thing may be the process through which one has to go.

Woodruff: So far as I can tell from working with three, four, or five different subject matter areas, there is no common structure that runs through them when you get down to specificity. You can talk about such psychological acts as perceiving, recognizing--those are common everywhere, throughout life. However, they don't tip you off to what the behaviors of the field are. The behaviors of the field are more the properties of the substances that you are acting upon than they are of anything psychological. Let me do this to illustrate--let me go back to the music people. We have identified three major categories: one of them consists of listening, thinking,

and deciding--these are all covert; the second is verbalizing--a great deal of verbalizing behavior is going on in music, not necessarily by the musician, but by other people; the third is making and performing. Now, let me give you behaviors under those. Under listening, thinking, and deciding, we have perceiving and recognizing. Specific examples of this would be a person forming aural impressions from notations or a person remembering recurring themes, a person characterizing sound in unique ways, in traditional ways. He discovers form or pattern in some musical material, he imposes a pattern from sounds around him, or he anticipates structures or resolutions or other things that are coming along, or he differentiates one substance in music from another. Now, those are very specific behaviors and very clearly operating in the field of music. They may not show up in some other field.

When you start to assess behaviors, first of all you want to find out what the behavior is. After that, ask the question, "How can I tell what is happening or how it is happening or what is contained in what is happening?" That's the testing question. Then start devising various ways of eliciting from persons responses which you can see or hear that tell you what is happening.

You must get to being very concrete, very specific in stating the behavior with which you are concerned. Once you get the thing out it looks incredibly simple, but it is an awful job to get it out. I think our feeling was tonight that unless we have gone through the labor of dredging it out, we really are not aware of what we are up against.

Woodruff: Once you have established the characteristics, the overt characteristics of a person's act, you might then lay out what Jack called the content of the package--those activities

leading the student to adopt the characteristics you desire him to acquire. For example, suppose you decide that in order to be an actor, a student should understand that an actor uses space. You must question, How do I help him get that understanding?

To help him, you must identify the critical properties of the phenomena before you can expose them to the student. That is where we really have to handle ourselves to find out what is this use of space, for instance? What are the critical properties of the use of space on the stage? And until you have pulled them out and identified them clearly, the best you can possibly do to a learner is to expose him in a very opaque fashion to something and leave it to him to discover it. On the other hand, if you can identify the critical properties and you expose him directly and very clearly, then learning can be quite rapid, and very precise.

You still have to say, How will I know that a student understands that an actor uses space? What must he say or do for me to make the judgment that he does indeed understand what I want him to understand? The task still remains of establishing the overt learning behaviors that you are going to associate with the development of the desired understanding. The behaviors which you identify here, will form the basis for your evaluation of the student's learning.

Audience: Sometimes we see as our task being inspirational rather than getting down to what we are really after--we busy ourselves whipping up enthusiasm. A book like the Dramatic Imagination is a lovely book, and everybody should read it every couple of years to get their adrenal flowing again, but it doesn't do a whole lot for opening up the critical properties of scene design.

Davis: But on the other hand we may do it because that is the lowest level of specificity that we are capable of getting at.

Audience: Isn't one of the real difficulties of theatre that of its simultaneity? Speaking, moving, acting, perceiving, etc. If for instance, you say we are going to deal just in pantomime so that the child doesn't have to deal with dialogue and we are not going to say he has to be a character, just be himself, still he is somebody, somewhere, doing something. Even if he doesn't have to worry about relationships, he still is handling multi-concepts. It is up to the teacher to decide which one out of five or six the child is handling, which one are you really working on today; you can't take them all away. It is almost impossible to work on a single concept in the theatre; it seems opposed to the very nature of theatre as a social art. And this is what worries me about so much of our exercise. There is so much going on at once it is even more important that we know our objective. It is more important that we delimit, but if we delimit too much we get nothing but a branch of exercises that may or may not add up to anything. If it is just one exercise after another, there is no more dramatic content.

Rosenblatt: That is not the problem of delimiting--that is the problem of not taking what you have delimited to each next natural step and linking it with something else and coming to some kind of conclusion. Delimiting just brings clarity of perception and clarity of thinking. Then it is the problem of putting all those things that we have delimited together, simultaneously. If we have done each part singly and clearly, we are liable to come up with a simultaneous performance which is very clear.

Addington: And identifying simultaneity is one of the outcomes of the actor, the critical property of the actor. In your training you must habituate a lot of things, you must habituate them so that they don't have to be the clear focus at performance time.

Woodruff: There's something else we should touch on before we conclude. We started off on evaluation, but we can't separate evaluation anymore from the content of the objectives and from the methods for developing a mastery of those objectives. Even in theatre--I think less so than in some fields--we are oriented to the old, academic model of education. This means that there is something,in the books that the person is supposed to learn and then when he gets it learned he can utilize it. The whole behavioral movement is founded on a biological principal that is a much sounder concept of learning I think than any that has come out of psychology. It's adaptation; that human behavior is shaped by its consequences. In biology they speak of this as the psychic adaptation mechanism, and what it means is that behavior changes only while the behavior itself is going on. Behavior is not changed by some act in which you pluck the person out of his behavioral setting and set him down in an artificial situation and have him memorize things and then go back to life. Behaviors are not affected by that kind of instruction; behaviors only change when persons are doing the kind of thing which you are interested in changing. The change is only produced by his perception of the consequence of what he does. Now that makes a very different game out of it. It means we quit transmitting stuff to students and get students involved in the actions we want them to be able to perform. And in order to make it successful with any dynamism at all, the teacher has got to get out of the way and the student has got to be the one who takes the initiative in doing this. He begins to govern his own behavior, to move deliberately to have some sense of what he is trying to achieve and to be his own self director in achieving. That puts the teacher in a very different kind of role. The teacher then is like a coach. We are familiar with this concept because we use it very successfully in some aspects of theatre, in many aspects of industrial or vocational education. We use it with tremendous success in football,

basketball. But it's a principal that has to persuade all the rest of education too. The teacher is one who watches the game going on. He does a lot of stage setting, a lot of very insightful watching, and manipulates the circumstances in which the game is happening; but the individual, or the learner, gets his cues not from the teacher but from the stuff he is working with and his own perception of what is happening. Then the teacher has to see that the learner perceives the actual consequences so that his behavior can adjust accordingly. Now, when we talk about going back to our teaching, and changing the content--changing methodology is more critical.

Davis: That is a hard change for a lot of teachers to make...

Addington: It seems to me that there is an inherent thing here too that is neglected in teaching the actor: the beauty of setting before him an objective that is possible--something he can achieve and receive some reward for.

Implications of Aesthetic Education For Teacher Education*

Calvin Lee Pritner

It is healthy for all of us in theatre education that this convention has devoted considerable attention to examining the actual and potential relationship between theatre educators and the aesthetic education movement. It is especially appropriate that theatre artist-teachers are asked to examine the functions that theatre can fulfill in educating the "whole child" and all children.

We have been reminded of one of theatre education's historic shortcomings--a failure to involve a majority of the school population in the kind of theatre experience that leads to a lifetime of theatre-going and theatre participation. We have tended to involve the most talented and highly motivated students to the exclusion, too often, of others who could profit from the experience of developing their sensibilities through theatre participation, whether as performers or as audience-participants.

The aesthetic education movement seems to demand that theatre educators take a new look at the functions and purposes of theatre education. We are asked to look beyond the theatre event as a production and examine the product in the context of the process of education. We are asked, "What is there in the process of theatre education that will help a child to be more alive, more sensitive, more human?" "Is the process of theatre education that is now being used the one that will be most productive of the kind of human beings whom we intend to educate?" "What can theatre educators (more to the point here, theatre-teacher-educators) do to reach more students who need an education that develops their aesthetic sensibilities?" Raising and attempting to answer these questions is the necessary business of all who are concerned with theatre education.

---

*Note: These remarks are a reconstruction and expansion of an extemporaneous presentation that was made as a part of a panel discussion on "Implications of Aesthetic Education for Teacher Education."

But, as I have heard some of the Center's presentations, and as I have meditated on the topic assigned to me, "Implications of Aesthetic Education for Teacher Education," I have also developed some concerns. For example: I get the impression that many who are advocating the aesthetic education movement tend to emphasize the educational process almost to the exclusion of product. The idea certainly has currency in much of contemporary educational literature. But, I am concerned that the emphasis on process could become an excuse for mediocrity in theatre education, producing a generation of artist-teachers who cover up their lack of artistic skill and commitment with alibis that have to do with emphasizing process rather than product in their theatrical performances.

Ideally, process and product can live a life of co-existence or even unity in the educational setting. The theatre teacher can possess skill, judgment, and talent without sacrificing integration of the arts, self-understanding, understanding of others, and humane emphasis on the pure pleasure of participation in artistic projects. It will require a fully educated and sensitive teacher, but that's always been a requirement; we're merely refining our objectives.

Closely related to the process-product dilemma, is my concern about the role of the teacher in education. Current jargon calls for the teacher to serve as facilitator of learning in the classroom, rather than as an agent who directly affects the educational experience of the student. As I understand those who advocate the facilitator role, they do so because of a belief that the student will learn best that which he himself seeks to know, feels a need to know; the teacher exists to provide resources for that self-generated quest. I agree but. What are the implications of this approach for the development of excellence in theatre art and artists? What does this mean to artist training, which has traditionally been based on the master-apprentice scheme, in which the student-apprentice studied the work of a master, under the direction of the master? Or, is that really the scheme under which contemporary theatre education works in America? Or, should it be?

Finally, I think we need to explore a concern (or perhaps a fear) that seems to exist in the space that separates two elements that I perceive in theatre education. Aesthetic Education proponents seem to be advocating a process-centered, whole-child, self-realization education on the one hand; on the other hand, I hear theatre educators articulating the need for a pursuit of greater excellence, deeper and more profound training in speech, movement, and technique for actors, more emphasis on the skills and techniques of the designer, all because we have been satisfied with too much mediocrity and too little commitment to artistic excellence. Are these necessarily opposed points of view? If they are, whose approach will do the most for our students? Whose for the art of theatre? Whose for theatre education?

These remarks seem to have raised more questions than they have answered, but perhaps that represents a necessary state of affairs as we begin to examine the implications of aesthetic education for teacher education.

An Interdisciplinary Model in the Arts And Its Implications for Teacher Education

Thomas A. Beagle

During the past two years we have sought a model for teaching the arts on an interdisciplinary basis. Antioch High School has an interdisciplinary, team taught class called the Arts and Humanities Forum. Four teachers and 100 students for two school hours worked together studying the arts using discovery, inquiry, and problem solving techniques. But a meaningful model was researched, developed, and this fall will be field tested. At this point in time, it has some interesting implication for teaching and teacher education.

The Model

Three dimensions were used in the shape of a box with six sides. The box has four sides, a top, and a bottom. For clarity, the sides will be identified as north, east, south, west, and top and bottom. There are four boxes and all are made from clear plastic. Each box is smaller than the previous one so that each box fits inside the previous one. When all the smaller boxes are inside the largest box, you have one box, with three others inside.

Outside Box. The outside and largest box is titled the Outside World. It surrounds the other three boxes which are titled Man. The Man is a single human being. The World's north side is titled People and represents all the people that Man meets and knows beginning with his family. The east side is Nature and is the world untouched by Man. Design is the south side and represents the creations of Man. The west side is a Mirror in which he reflects. The top is Media, all the known and unknown methods of communication. The bottom is the Past, the history and culture into which Man is born.

Three Inside Boxes. There are three boxes inside the outside box. The boxes together represent a single Man, or human being. Each box is a level of development for Man. The first inside box is a first level, or beginning. Man starts here with almost everything that is new to him. The second inside box (inside the first inside box) is a developmental level. The third inside box (inside the second inside box) is the advanced level. The north side for all the inside boxes is called You and is the participation side of Man. Environment is the east side. Environment includes all the things Man has invented and designed. The south side is titled Observer--Man looks and listens to the Outside World. The west side is called the Synthesizer side of Man. Man on this side organizes people, places, and things. The top is Media, the same as the Outside World, and the bottom is the Past. Man's Past includes his experiences that he retains for future use.

The Boxes' Relationships. All three inside boxes have the same basic title on their sides. However, as Man learns something new, he advances his knowledge from the beginning level through the developmental level of the second box to the advanced level of the third box. Man is never in isolation. The Outside World surrounds him and directly affects him. If Man chooses to be an Observer, the south side, he must observe something from the Outside World.

Each box can rotate inside the other boxes which enclose it so that any of the six sides of one box can face any of the six sides of the next box. When Man rotates his Observer side to observe, say, Nature on the Outside World, he can rotate all three levels of Observer. He can also use any combination from the second and third levels as need demands. Now that the selection of sides is complete, Man then can select the level to Observe. First level could be just enjoying Nature and nothing more. However, Man could desire to study the causes of earthquakes and shift to the third level. The selection of sides and levels is learned. The development of each side so that no single side overbalances the others is learned. Man learns how to accept and reject. We have not discussed what Man learns. If the model so far is viable, then it may have some implications for teachers.

Implications for Teachers

The model suggests a process approach to learning. Man must learn how to learn. Teachers must develop strategies and methods of teaching the Man how to cope with the geometric problem that the four boxes suggest. Six times six times six times six equals at least 7776 separate selections. We could add to each side several steps in the process of that side and only multiply the 7776 figure out of this world. It is assumed that all sides of the three inside boxes should develop equally. How is that done? What instruments of measurement do we need? And how do we teach teachers how to teach Man how to learn? I can only suggest that a teacher should be trained in depth in at least one discipline; that the teacher must be shown ways to provide interdisciplinary teaching at all levels, all disciplines; but that the emphasis on the Man is on how he learns, the process of learning, an interdisciplinary man, balanced better.

So, What Is Aesthetic Education?

Morris Weitz

It is as difficult to sum up the results of the sessions devoted to aesthetic education as it is impossible to define aesthetic education. But lest you despair and persist in your various hesitations about the meaning and role of aesthetic education in your own field of the dramatic arts, let me assure you that a definition of theatre or drama is not forthcoming either. For these concepts--aesthetic, education, theatre, drama, even art, itself, along with certain genre concepts, such as tragedy, satire, or comedy, or certain style concepts, such as Gothic, Mannerism, or Cubism--are not definable either.

And the reason these concepts are not definable is that their histories and uses reveal that they function under debatable sets of criteria, not under agreed-upon sets of criteria. Even one of the themes of the sessions, that of acting, which ranges from convincing pretense to complete identification of the character protrayed, is not definable.

All these concepts or terms and their corresponding activities are open in the precise sense that though we can, hopefully, fall back on clear cases, we cannot successfully state a set of characteristics--a common denominator--in virtue of which they are clear cases of a closed class. A superb example of this openness is tragedy. Here, too, philosophers, critics, and playwrights, from Aristotle to the present day, have exercised themselves over the nature and definition of theory of tragedy. To the three basic questions: Is there a true theory of tragedy? Can there be such a theory? Need there be such a theory if we are to know what we are talking about in analyzing particular dramatic tragedies? Affirmative answers have been given. Yet the sad fact remains that no one has come up with such a theory; and the debate continues unabated. Nor is the situation any better if we turn from general theories or definitions of

tragedy to the specific theories about a particular tragedy. An examination, for example, of the reasons given for Hamlet or even Hamlet being tragic brings out the same logical feature of openness: these reasons range from hamartia to arete and they not only differ but contradict each other. Since these disagreements are intelligent and have produced some of the grandest critical judgments as well as productions of the play in western drama, we must conclude that the tragic is debatable and hence not amenable to definition. We know that Hamlet or Oedipus Rex is a tragedy--the clear case--but we do not know and cannot know, in the sense of proving it, why it is tragic. Every reason critic or producer or actor A gives is rejectable by his fellow, B.

There is a lesson to be learned here which is that we need not swallow what I shall venture to call the Myth of Definition: that we must define our basic terms in order to use them intelligently. It seems to me that we must dispel this myth; otherwise, since we cannot define some of these terms, we are in effect rendered speechless.

If we reject the myth of the need to define, we can return to our central concern of aesthetic education and ask, What is it? without necessarily thinking that any substantive answer will consist in a definition.

Aesthetic education, as a concept, differs from aesthetic and education or, for that matter, from theatre or drama, in one important respect: it has no history. Instead it was introduced, not too long ago, as a term to fill a certain need, to cover and correct a certain deficiency which its inventors felt was threatening the whole of the early educational development of the child. And what was (and is) this need? The lack of recognition of the importance of the arts and all of their potential in the normal education of the child. The term was coined with the deep conviction that this gap must be bridged, the need fulfilled; the commitment to the importance of art and the aesthetic as an integral rather than marginal constituent of early education which was to be heard and shared by all.

Thus, I suggest, the way to understand what aesthetic education is is not to define it but to state its great goal: the enhancement of the full growth of the child in which the aesthetic--as open as that term is--would achieve at least an equal status with the intellectual. Looked at in this way, we can clarify the concept of aesthetic education as the attempt to extend the affective, imaginative, formal, perceptual, and cognitive possibilities of the arts, in all of their individual autonomy as well as their collective diversity to at least three types of children, which indeed encompass every child. These are (1) the underprivileged; (2) the undereducated; and (3) the underperceptive. For aesthetic education was conceived of as a total commitment to the arts and what they have to offer in human development as an essential birthright of the child as he begins his education. The arts, traditionally regarded as an excrescence both in school and in society, a luxury, an elitist endeavor, must be transformed into a necessity--as important as the recognized disciplines of the intellect--in both the school and in society.

It is this conviction about art and its enormous potential for the child as a person and as a responsive member of a social as well as physical environment that best explains the diverse yet related roles of CEMREL, The JDR 3rd Fund, and the Rhode Island program, about which we have heard so much during these sessions. Each of these is dedicated in its own exploratory way to bringing the arts and the aesthetic to one or another of the three groups of children mentioned.

The goal of aesthetic education also explains the various debates and notorious difficulties surrounding these debates about matters of curricula, teacher training, and assessment techniques and criteria of the cumulative successes of aesthetic education. The issues involved in these debates cannot be settled easily; great patience as well as fortitude are required if we are to do justice to the goal and, more important, to the children as the center of the whole enterprise.

Because aesthetic education concerns the child as a developing, total human being, it has at least one far-reaching philosophical implication that

should not be lost sight of in the minutiae of procedures and accomplishments. For it is an implication about the whole child--that his body, including his senses as well as his physical movements, is as important as his mind. The emphasis upon the perceptual domain of art especially constitutes an onslaught against the traditional philosophical hegemony of the intellect over the sensuous in human development. It is just here that aesthetic education may be seen as a revolutionary attempt to establish a kind of democracy of the diverse constituents and requirements of human nature: its basic claim is against the elitist conception of the role of the intellect in the education of the child; its aim is a proper balance of the mind and the body, in which the senses are awakened by the potentials of the arts. Considered in this way, aesthetic education represents the consummation of the classical ideal of a proper unity of mind and body. By opening up and exploring the possibities of his whole person, aesthetic education aims at the creation of the child as a total being in which his receptivity to the arts and his engagement with them become equal with the demands of the intellect and their recognized disciplines.

Because of its openness, aesthetic education must be as wary of any self-imposed closures as it is opposed to traditional imposed-upon, closures. That is, it must not only reject the hegemony of the intellect or its tyranny in education, it must also recognize the legitimate demands of technique, skill, integrity of materials, and craftsmanship, without which art is impossible and aesthetic education compromised and self-defeating. This means that even aesthetic education must recognize and accommodate the role of the mind as well as of the heart, the place of the specialist intent upon exclusion in his concern with only one art, and also the place of the universalist with his concern for the communality of all the arts. Thus, aesthetic education is not dedicated to the overthrow of the intellect--that way lies anarchy; its goal is more temperate, more democratic--only to overthrow the tyranny of the intellect.

Consequently, if aesthetic education is to achieve its great aim of the education of the whole person, it must pay homage not only to obsession with one art but to the intellect as well and, in particular, to the activity and

skill of articulation--in short, to language. For it is not enough to bring children to feel, see, imagine, experience. They must also be taught to speak, to make clear what they experience. This teaching is, of course, the beginning of the whole art of literature but also of communication. Its instrument, language, is as precious as any other, whether it be paint, tones, or stones. It cannot be ignored or, worse, desecrated by artists and others on the fallacious ground that language and articulation destroy the feelings. Such a view is not a defense of the aesthetic, as too many think, but rather its violation, as serious as a contempt for any other artistic medium.

This admonition, of course, does not apply to you of the theatre. You love language, respecting it as you do your "life's blood." But it does apply to aesthetic educators who, perhaps unwittingly, play down the role of language, its wondrous sinuosity, ostensible sensuousness, and cognitive beauty--not in their concern for the art of literature but in their reports about what aesthetic education is. As I see it, the greatest danger to aesthetic education, if it is to remain aesthetic, is in its wholesale acceptance of a jargon, modeled on both governmental memoranda and scientific systems, that is incorporated in the language of aesthetic education. I end, then, with the first principle of aesthetic education: If you are to educate fully, learn to write well; if you are to write well, bow before your medium as you do before the subject of your writing. For unless we are willing to love and revere our own children, we will never be able to respect the children of others. And in the realm of language and communication, I remind you, none of us is childless.